A REPLY TO D^R. MORTONS GENERALL DEFENCE OF THREE NOCENT CEREMONIES.

viz.

The Surplice, Croſſe in Baptiſme, and kneeling at the receiving of the ſacramentall elements of Bread and Wine.

7

◆

Printed in yeare 1622.

789;08

THE PREFACE.

SIR,

Howſoever ther be many vnknown motiues which lead men in theſe dayes unto conformitie, yet thoſe which are openly profeſsed, may be referred either vnto M. Sprints way, who confeſseth the ceremonies to be impoſed contrary unto the rules of Gods word, and yet contendeth that they are to be uſed in caſe of deprivation: Or elſe to D. Mortons way, who avoucheth the ſayd ceremonies to be agreeable unto the rules of Gods word, and therfore ſuch as ought to be obſerved ſimply. Now he that conſidereth wel of the matter, ſhall find that there is no ground for the conſcience to reſt on in either of theſe wayes. As for M. Sprint, (to ſpeak nothing of his miſ-alledging very many authors) he hath but three main arguments: and to all three he hath given ſufficient anſwer himſelfe. His firſt argument is taken from the doctrine and practiſe of the Apoſtles about the Jewiſh ceremonies. Now all the force of this reaſon doth depend upon that paritie or equalitie which is ſuppoſed to be betwixt our ceremonies and the Jewiſh, our miniſters warrant and the Apoſtles: ſo that if this paritie faileth, the whole argument falleth. Yet M. Sprint himſelfe confeſseth, pag. 250. 256. that theſe Jewiſh ceremonies were not every way ſo evill as ours are: neither doth or dare he ſay, that miniſters now haue ſuch particular warrant for conformitie, as the Apoſtles had for applying themſelves a little while unto ſome of the Jewiſh ceremonies.

His ſecond reaſon is, that a leſser dutie muſt yeeld unto a greater. Now this caſe by his own cõfeſsion p. 50. doth not hold ſo, as that a man ſhould doe a thing formally, ſimply, and in nature evill, for any good. Now he knoweth, as appeareth p. 45. that the ceremonies in controverſie are eſteemed ſuch by moſt of theſe that now oppoſe them. So that this reaſon can be of no force with them.

His third reaſon is, becauſe refuſall of conformitie in caſe of deprivation, tendeth to condemne in a manner all true Churches which haue taught and practiſed otherwiſe. Hee meaneth by condemning, *accuſing of error. Now M. Sprint himſelfe doth thus condemne all or the moſt of the Churches which he alledgeth to haue practiſed ſuch ceremonies. For in confeſsing our ceremonies to be inconvenient, ſcandalous, evill, ſuch as the urging of them cannot be juſtified, and yet affirming that almoſt all Churches haue appointed and uſed ſuch, even out of the caſe of deprivation or ſuch like neceſsitie, doth he not plainly accuſe all thoſe Churches of error? Theſe things conſidered, I thought it needleſs to ſpend much time in examining M. Sprints booke any further. But according to your deſire, I will ſhew you mine opinion in briefe concerning the chiefe paſsages which are in Thomas Cheſters, or as he was wont to be called, Doctor Mortons Defence of three ceremonies, commonly uſed in our Churches, which I doe the more willingly vndertake, becauſe divers things are therin handled of ſingular vſe in divinitie, whereof I profeſs my ſelfe a Student, though in the miniſterie I cannot find a ſetled ſtation. But before I come to the Defence it ſelfe, firſt, I would faine vnderſtand the reaſon why* three Ceremonies *are onely defended, ſeeing there be many threes of thoſe things which ſtay many godly men from ſubſcription and conformitie, as is to be ſeen even in that abridgement which this Defender doth chiefly oppoſe? Is it becauſe our beſt Prelats haue onely a care to perſwade if it may be, thoſe that are in the miniſtery, to that conformity which is moſt of all noted, not regarding in the meane time, what becommeth of ſo many godly learned yong men, who not onely for theſe, but for divers other corruptions alſo, are forced to turne away from the miniſterie, whereunto their education, gifts and hearts did carry them, while many lewd fellowes, the chiefe ſpots and blots of our congregations, doe poſseſs their places.*

I would know alſo what the reaſon ſhould be, that the innocencie *onely of theſe ceremonies is defended? Is this all that is required in ceremonies forcibly obtruded upon miniſters and people, even to the ſilencing, excommunicating, and utter undoing of many hundreds? Is this all, I ſay, that is required, that ſuch ceremonies be in ſome ſence innocent, or not hurtfull? ſurely not ſcripture onely, and ſound reaſon, but common ſenſe will looke for ſome good neceſsarie uſe in ſuch ceremonies,*

monies, and not innocencie alone.

And then what is the ſence (trow you) in which theſe ceremonies may be called Innocent? when Calvin (whom the Defender calleth an honorable witnes) would deviſe a charitable title for them, he ſtiles them tolerabiles ineptiæ, viz. tolerable fooleries, or fopperies, Epiſt. 200. & 206. When he ſpeaketh more out of iudgement, hee not onely calleth them frivoulous and unprofitable, but ſaith plainlie that their proper name is hurtfull, noxious, or nocent, cleane contrarie to this Defendants language. Surely one of theſe writers, not differing onely, but flatly oppoſing and contradicting the other, muſt needs be farre wide.

Innocent indeed theſe ceremonies may be called in regard of their materials, and the faſhions alſo which they haue in their naturall being: for the cloth of a Surpleſs and the faſhion of it is innocent, and ſo are all the idols of Papiſts and Heathens verie innocent: ſo that this is no praiſe. But if we look at the uſe whereunto they haue been applyed, and wherein they haue beene a long time employed, I may truely ſay by the devill, not onely among the Papiſts, but even in our Churches, to the breeding of diſſention and diſtraction among brethren, to quenching of many, and many a burning ſhining light, to the grieving and unſetling of ſo many good ſoules, and to the advancing of the Kingdome of darkeneſs: If theſe things I ſay be conſidered, then it is more then maniſeſt, that this licking them over with a fair word will make them no more innocent indeed then Pilats hands were when they were waſhed. The faſhion of a Surplice naturall or artificiall in another uſe, as if a Porter or Baker weare ſuch a garment is indifferent.

If it ſhall be ſaid, that notwithſtanding theſe accidentall abuſes, yet the ceremonies are innocent in their own nature and uſe: I anſwer, firſt, they having no neceſſary uſe otherwaies, and theſe being the ordinary effects which haue followed on them, there is no rule of Logick much leſs of zeale that will allow the Defendant ſimply to call them innocent. 2 It is a ſhame for our Prelates to talk of the ceremonies innocencie, when they cannot defend their own innocencie in obtruding and urging of them. They are wont to ſay, the practiſe and manner of urging we will not defend, but the lawfulneſs or innocencie of the things themſelues. Indeed for a private man to ſtand upon ſuch termes is tolerable: but for the Prelates, whoſe hands are chiefe in this treſpaſs, to cover their owne guiltineſs under figleaved innocencie of three ceremonies, is too too groſſe. If Thomas or D. Morton in times paſt had pleaded for the ceremonies innocencie, it might haue been well interpreted: but for Thomas Cheſter, Thomas Lichfild, or any that beareth a Cathedrall name, to write of the innocencie of three ceremonies, paſſing by three hundred foule nocencies which are plainly to be ſeen in the Prelates urging and managing of theſe ceremonies, this is ſomewhat like as if Samſon when he had ſent Foxes with firebrands in their tailes among the corn, ſhould then haue written unto the owners of that corne a long letter concerning the innocencie of Foxes and Fire-brands.

Thirdly and laſtly, it is ſufficiently proved, and ſhall (by Gods grace) be further maintained againſt this Defendant, that theſe three ceremonies are not innocent or lawfull in their uſe.

This I had to ſay concerning the Title. Now before I come to the book it ſelfe, ſome few things are to be queſtioned in the Epiſtles, which are three, according to the number of the ceremonies defended.

In the firſt Epiſtle to the Marquis, 1 I would willingly learn, what that Church is, which is the mother of the Non-conformiſts? it muſt of neceſſitie be either the faithfull Congregations which are in England, collectiuely conſidered: or elſe the Hierarchie, conſiſting of Archbiſhops, Biſhops and their Officers. If the former be here underſtood, then this Defence is begunne with a Slander. For neither is the Non-conformiſt an adverſarie impugning thoſe Congregations, nor doe they defame their religious worſhip, nor infringe their wholeſome libertie, nor contemne their juſt authoritie: but of all theſe things are the Prelates manifeſtly guiltie. For they in their Lordly humours, doe ſcorne and defame the moſt religious people as Puritanes: they hinder the people from hearing of Sermons in another pariſh, though they haue none, or worſe then none at home: they are enemies to that preaching wherby the godly people finde themſelues moſt edified: they inſlaue both Miniſter and people, not onely to themſelues, but even to their Chancellors, Commiſſaries, officials, and ſuch like officers of their own making, to whom not Chriſt onely, but all the Primitiue Church ſaith plainely, Depart from me I know you not: they denie anie authoritie at all to be either in the Congregations, or in their Miniſters, except it *be a little of courteſie from the Ordinarie. Theſe things are ſo well known, that they need no proofe.*

If by the Church heer be meant the Hierarhie, then wee profeſs plainely we acknowledge no ſuch mother. She is a Step-dame, uſurping this title and authoritie, without all warrant from God our Father. Shee is a creature of mans making, and may more lawfullie be removed when it pleaſeth man, then ever ſhe was by him erected.

Secondly, I marvaile with what conſcience this man can ſpend a great part of his Epiſtle in ſtirring up a Courtier unto the oppoſing of Non-conformiſts? As if this were a great point of admirable wiſedome and zeale, as he calleth it: and the Courtiers ſuch, as ſtood in moſt need of inſtigations to the zeale of Formalitie, being otherwiſe for ſubſtance ſuch as they ſhould be.

Thirdlie, what agreement is there in this Argument, to conjure a man by the obligation of his Baptiſme, to ſtand for the defence of certaine ceremonies? Was he baptized into the faith of the ceremonies? or is he bound to maintaine everie ceremonie which men haue brought into that Church where he was baptized? If he were conjured by his Biſhoping to ſuch things as theſe, there would be more reaſon in the conſequence.

Fourthlie, what need is there that great men ſhould be called to aide and aſſiſt the Prelats againſt Non-conformiſts? haue they not power enough in their own hands? can they not at their own pleaſure ſuſpend, depriue, excommunicate, & what almoſt they pleaſe? Do they not tread theſe poore men under their feet? Is it becauſe that the Prelats cannot yet ſufficientlie prevaile againſt thē in the conſciences of men, and therfore call for further help in vaine? Or is the meaning, that ſuch men ſhould be helped unto great Biſhopricks, as are moſt zealous againſt Non-conformiſts? If this be the matter, I dare ſay the Petition ſhall be granted; and yet the Petitioner, except he make great progreſſe in this eagerneſs, will hardlie get beyond Lichfild, at leaſt not to Canterburie.

In the ſecond Epiſtle to the Non-conformiſts, manie things are jumbled together, which afterward muſt be examined, but here cannot. For this Epiſtle taketh the whole book for unanſwerable, and therefore ſhould rather haue been ſet at the end then at the beginning: onelie one ridiculous piece of Rhetorick is to be touched, wherein (for-

ſooth) the Non-conformiſts aboue all their other faults wherewith they are uſuallie charged and loaded, are now as it were lovinglie intreated to acknowledge themſelues guiltie of ſuperſtition. The reaſon is rendred, becauſe there is a negatiue ſuperſtition, the formall cauſe whereof is the forbearing and forbidding of things lawfull as unholy and profane: and the Non-conformiſts haue ſuch negatiue opinions, as kneel not, croß not, weare not, &c.

All this is nothing elſe but a truck of prevention uſuall with craftie men, who chooſe to lay that upon their adverſaries which they know more properly to belong unto themſelues. But I would that this Defendant, or rather Accuſant, had given us ſome plaine reaſon of his new opinion, there is no definition of ſuperſtition, properly ſo called, that will father this concluſion. The Schoolemen doe with one conſent place ſuperſtition in a kind of exceß of Religions worſhip, Thom. 2. 2 q. 92. art. 1, from whom in this point our Divines doe not diſſent. Now though this exceß do ſeem ſometims to conſiſt in a negation, yet an exceß or errour in negation, is never called by any author that ever writ (I dare ſay) ſuperſtition, when he meaneth to ſpeake properly, except that very negation, abſtinence or forbearing be held as a ſpecial worſhip. Now in the Non-conformiſts there is no ſuch thing to be found: they doe not abſtaine from theſe Ceremonies, but as they doe from other unlawfull corruptions. Suppoſe they erre, yet everie erronious deniall of things lawfull is not ſuperſtition.

The Defendant therefore heere being overhaſtie to charge his adverſaries, conſidered not well what weapon he chooſe. But if he had well remembred what is ſaid of ſuperſtition, not onely by our Divines, but even by ſome of the Papiſts themſelues, he would haue forborne to make mention of this word. For our Divines, let honourable Calvin ſpeak, Inſt. l. 1 c. 12. ſ. 1 Inde mihi videtur dicta ſuperſtitio, quod modo & præſcripta ratione non contenta ſupervacuam rerum congeriem accumulet. Papiſts thus. Superſtitio eſt (ſaith Azorius Inſt. mor. l. 9 c. 11) cum quis Deo cultum tribuit inanem & vanum, ſcil. commentitia & futili aliqua cæremonia eum venerando, vel cum quis Deum honorat falſis vanis, & frivolis ceremoniis, id eſt, As Swarez doth in a manner interpret it, quando honor Dei in iis rebus ponitur, quibus revera non colitur, ut in cæremoniis ſuperfluis, & ad ſalutem animæ nihil conferentibus. If this touch not the Defendant, I would deſire him to peruſe what

M. Parker

Mr. Parker hath written concerning the ſuperſtition of the Croſſe, and giue ſome anſwer to the ſame, before he threaten any more ſuch kindneſs as this is upon the Nonconformiſts.

Another thing alſo is by a figure of prætermition inſinuated in this Epiſtle, not unworthie conſideration, viz. that many Parliaments and Convocations haue eſtabliſhed theſe rites. To this I anſwer, 1 the Prelats in ſuch matters as theſe, haue no reſpect unto the authoritie of Parliaments. For they frame Canons, urge and execute them without the conſent of any Parliament, nay flatly againſt them. For ſo wee reade in the Records of that worthie Parliament which was ann: 1610. Among the Canons late made by the Clergie of England in their Convocation, it vvas thought that ſome of their Canons did extend to charge the bodies, lands, and goods of the ſubjects of the Realme, further then vvas lawfull and meet. We therefore made a good law to make voide ſuch Canons as doe charge the bodies, lands, and goods of the ſubjects, unleſſe that the ſame canons vvere confirmed by Parliament. *2 The Defendant cannot bring forth one Act of Parliament now in force, that doth allow of Subſcriptions and Conformitie to be urged as now it is by the Prelats. This appeareth by the judgement of the foreſaid Parliament in thoſe words of their petition, where they complaine, That* diverſe painfull and learned Paſtors that haue long travelled in the vvork of the Miniſtery, vvith good fruit and bleſſing of their labours, vvho vvere ever readie to performe the legall Subſcription, appointed by the Statute of 13 Eliz. which onely concerneth the Confeſſion of the true Chriſtian Faith, and doctrine of the Sacraments, yet for not conforming in ſome points of Ceremonies, and refuſing the Subſcription directed by the late Canons, haue been removed from their Eccleſiaſticall livings, being their freehold, and debarred from all meanes of maintenance, to the great griefe of ſundry well-affected Subjects. *3 It is well known that the Prelates themſelues in their proceedings about theſe matters, doe ſo farre violate the Statutes of Parliament, that they are by law ſubject unto a Præmunire.*

Now as for Convocations, not to diſpute here what manner of Synods they be, 1 It is well known that they conſiſt now of a Faction, and that in memorie of man, they never concluded any thing for the common good of the Church more then by others was better done to their hands: but much evill hath come from among them, and more would *but that many times their commiſsion ſerveth not but onely to give Subſidies, and then to tell the clock. 2 They are ſervile to thoſe on whom they depend, and tirannicall over the poore that are ſubject unto them: 3 there are verie few that haue place in them which are not groſs offenders againſt the moſt ancient Canons. As for example, it was obſerved that in that Convocation which eſtabliſhed and revived theſe corruptions, of 300 or 400, there were not aboue twiſe three, which were not, or had not been groſs Non-reſidents or Pluraliſts. D. Morton himſelfe, in a Latine Sermon had before a Convocation ſome 8 yeares ſince, deſcribed well the moſt part of them (though he did not ſpeak diſtinctlie of the number) to be unſavorie ſalt. For he gaue us three notes whereby corrupt Miniſters in England might be diſcerned. 1 That they ſtudied chieflie and ſtuft their Sermons with Friers and Jeſuits: 2 that they ſought occaſions to diſgrace Calvin: and 3 that if anie neighbour Miniſter be more diligent and conſcionable then they, they brand him ſtraight with the name of Puritan. Theſe notes are well known to agree unto moſt of our convocated Prelates. 4 The authoritie of this Convocation either againſt or without conſent of Parliament, is not to be regarded, much leſs againſt the Scriptures.*

In the Epiſtle to the Reader, this onelie I would inquire of, what is the reaſon, that ſeeing he chooſe to himſelfe for Cheiſe Oppoſites, *the Lincolneſhire Miniſters, he doth not deale with all their Arguments, nor the twentieth part of their Allegations, but onelie with ſuch as he thought fitteſt for his purpoſe? Of this I will not ſaie all. But this I maie not omit, that conſidering he knew how much hath been ſaid againſt the Ceremonies by them and others, eſpeciallie by M. Parker, which he never attempted to anſwer, neither hee, nor others for him, had anie cauſe to triumph in this booke, as in a compleate Defenſe.*

A Reply to Doctor MORTONS GENERAL DEFENCE OF THREE Nocent Ceremonies.

CAP. I. SECT. II.

VVHATSOEVER is objected in this Section for the All-ſufficiencie or perfect fulneſſe of the Scripture, I will take for granted, becauſe nothing is denyed by the Defendant. It is granted therefore at the firſt entrance, that the Scripture condemneth whatſoever is done, not onely againſt the vvarrant and direction of the Word, but alſo that vvhich is done beſide it.

SECT. III.

BVT that which before the Defendant durſt not denie, now he commeth to oppoſe in the proofes of it: Which is a ſtrange courſe, in him eſpecially that profeſſeth a diſtinct logicall proceeding.

In the propounding of our confirmation, I note two things once here in the beginning for all following occaſions to be marked, 1 this Defendant doth us wrong in diſtributing our confirmations into thoſe vvhich are taken from Scriptures, and thoſe that are from the Fathers, and thoſe that are from Proteſtant Divines: as if theſe were in our eſtimation of the ſame kinde. Wheras we profeſſe that vvee aſcribe no force unto any teſtimony of man, as if it vvere a proofe, but onely bring ſuch allegations in as illuſtrations in regard of our adverſaries perverſe prejudice. 2 He vvrongeth us likewiſe in that difference vvhich he inſinuateth betwixt the Fathers and our Divines, calling their teſtimonies *Iudgements*, and the other onely *Confeſſions*: we acknowledge no ſuch imparitie. If this vvere nothing but idle rhetorick in the Defendant, it may be paſſed by.

In the anſwer brought to Heb.3 2, vve haue this diſtinction given us: *ſome points concerning religion are doctrinall, and ſome meerly ceremoniall. The former are ſufficiently revealed in Scripture: but the latter are left to the libertie of the Church*. But 1 vvhy is that denyed here by a diſtinction, which paſſed vvithout deniall or diſtinction in the former ſection? 2 vvhat kind of diſtinction is this, vvhich doth not diſtinguiſh of any terme vvhich is in the objection? 3 the Defendant ſhould haue done vvell to haue explained and confirmed his diſtinction. For *doctrinall* oppoſed to *ceremoniall* in the formall ſignification of theſe vvords, I never heard of before that I remember: and ſure I am no ſound reaſon vvill allow. *Ceremoniall* is oppoſed to *Morall*, and ſometime to *ſubſtantiall*; but to *doctrinall* it cannot properly, becauſe there is ceremoniall doctrine as vvell as morall or ſubſtantiall. 4 To vvhich of theſe points vvill the Def referre the Hierarchie of Biſhops? or are they no points of Religion? For the negatiue part of this anſwer, that *ceremoniall points of Religion are not revealed in the Scripture, but left to the libertie of the Church*: it is too too nakedly ſet down for to beare any colour of truth vvith it. For 1 vvas this true before the comming of Chriſt? then all the ceremoniall law is Apocriphall. 2 is this true univerſally (as it is heere ſet down) in the new Teſtament? then vvater in baptiſme, and bread and wine in the Lords Supper, are no ceremoniall points of Religion. 3 the caution that is given Deut 4 2 and ſuch like, did they not conteyne in them ceremoniall points of Religion? then it vvas lawfull for the Iewes, to adde, detract, and alter the ceremonies according to their pleaſure; and doth not that law binde us as vvell as the Iewes? then vve doe the Papiſts wrong, in putting them to ſo much trouble as vve doe in finding out ſhifts to avoide the dint vvhich ſuch places giue them.

But to leaue this miſhapen diſtinction: An anſwer is given at length to the place alledged out of Heb. 3.2 concerning the compariſon betwixt Chriſt and Moſes: ſect.4 5.

SECT. IIII.

IN this Section compariſon is made betwixt Chriſt and Moſes in reall faithfulnes, as he calleth it. But this ſufficeth not to looſe the knot. For Moſes vvas faithfull in all the houſe of God, and Chriſt vvas not inferiour, but in all parts of his office Propheticall concerning all points of Religion, vvas no doubt as faithfull as Moſes.

SECT. V.

HEre the Defendant can find nothing to bring out of Scripture for Chriſts faithfulneſſe in rituall ordinances, but as *Moſes* appointed ceremonies, ſo Chriſt removed them. Is not this a proper explication of Scripture, to interpret a ſimilitude by a diſſimilitude? The Scripture maketh Chriſt like unto *Moſes*: this Defendant expoundeth the likeneſſe to be in this, that Chriſt pulled down that which *Moſes* had ſet up.

Out of M. *Calvin*, *Inſtit. lib.* 4. *c.* 10. § 30. he taketh upon him to decide this queſtion. But he ſhould haue dealt more plainly, and according to the ſcope of his author, if he had cited *Bellarmine de pont. l.* 4. *c.* 17. where the ſame words are according to his meaning. For in that place of *Calvin* there is nothing at all which vvithout groſſe æquivocation will ſerve the Defendants purpoſe: For *Calvins* meaning was nothing leſſe then to teach that Chriſt had given libertie unto men for to preſcribe at their diſcretion myſticall ſignes in the Church: but onely to diſpoſe of ſuch circumſtances as in their kind are neceſſarie, but in particular determination doe varie. He inſtanceth in the next ſection in the circumſtance of time, vvhat houre the congregation ſhould meet: in the place, how large, or in what faſhion the Church ſhould bee built: in meere order, what Pſalmes ſhould be ſung at one time, and what another time. Theſe and ſuch like circumſtances of order and comelineſſe, equally neceſſary in civill and religious actions are underſtood by *Calvin*: not ſignificant ceremonies, proper unto religious worſhip, ſuch as ours are now in controverſie. This allegation therefore borroweth all the ſhew it hath from the ambiguous meaning of the word ceremonies.

The ſame deceit is in the known caſe which the Defendant adjoyneth to *Calvins* words. For if by *Rites* he meaneth ſuch circumſtances of order and decencie, as were before mentioned, then I grant all he ſaith: but if by *Rites* he meaneth ceremonies properly of religious nature, uſe, and ſignification, ſuch as the croſſe in baptiſme, and ſurplice are knowne to be, then there is no reaſon in his ſpeech. For 1. there is no neceſſitie that in any nation the Churches ſhould haue any religious ceremonie of ſpirituall ſignification, beſide thoſe which Chriſt hath appointed to all: and if the Defendant can ſhew any ſuch neceſſitie, then I would deſire him alſo to ſhew by what rules, and for vvhat cauſe theſe religious ceremonies impoſed upon us in England, are fitter for us, or tend more to our edification, then other ceremonies would, or then they would in any other nation under heaven. Except both theſe poſitions be proved, the words of this ſection are all but wind: and proved I am ſure they never were nor will be.

SECT. VI. VII.

THe ſecond place of Scripture handled by the defendant, is 2. Sam. 7.7. Where I cannot but marvell why ſo reſolute a diſputer would paſſe by in ſilence, Deu. 4. 2. & 12. 32. Prov. 30. 6. Lev. 10. 12. all which places are alledged by the Lincolnſhire miniſters (againſt whom he profeſſeth principally to write) & chooſe this place which they bring in after the former. Was there not a cauſe? But to take him as we finde him, he profeſſeth plainly, that it vvas lawfull for David vvithout ſpeciall vvarrant to build a houſe unto God: and in this he is ſo peremptory, that he condemneth the contrary opinion of notable precipitancie, and preſumeth to make this example a ground of confutation againſt his adverſaries, diſputing as he pedantically ſpeaketh firſt by *extortion*, and then by *retortion* out of this place. But if his extortion bee meere torting and torturing of the text, we need not feare his retortion.

Now that the purpoſe of *David* vvas partly condemned, appeareth plainly, 1. becauſe it vvas prohibited, as here the Defendant in his anſwer expreſſely granteth. 2. Becauſe as honorable M. *Calvin* well obſerveth on Act. 7. 46. *It was not lawfull for man to chooſe a place for Gods Name & Ark, but it was to be placed in that place which God himſelfe ſhould ſhew, as Moſes doth often admoniſh. Neither durſt David himſelfe bring the Ark into the threſhing floore of Arauna, vntill the Lord by an Angel from heaven had witneſſed unto him that that was the place choſen by himſelfe*, 2. Sam. 24. 11. 3. Becauſe it cannot bee abſolutely excuſed from ſome mixture of raſhneſſe vvith zeal, that he ſhould reſolue abſolutely to build an houſe unto God, before he knew either vvhat manner of houſe God vvould haue built, or when, or by whom: ſeeing vvithout the eſpeciall direction and aſſiſtance of Gods ſpirit, nothing of this kind could bee well done. How could *David* haue built a houſe, except the Lord had filled vvith the ſpirit of vviſedome *Bezaliel* and *Aboliab*, or ſome ſuch?

The Arguments brought by the Defendant for the contrary opinion are nothing worth. 1. *Nathan* (ſayth he) *had allowed the purpoſe of David*, v. 3. But iudicious *Iunius* anſwereth (in his notes upon that place) that ſo *Samuel* out of humane infirmitie, ſaid that *Eliab* vvas the man vvhom God vvould haue king, 1. Sam. 16. 7. 2. *God calleth David his ſervant, which hee never doth in reproofe*. Which is not true, though the reproofe be for a thing ſimply evill: as is plainly to be ſeen Iſa. 1. 3, Ier. 2. 13. and in many ſuch places, vvhere *my people* is as much as *my ſervant*. But the very word *Servant* alſo is twice thus uſed in one verſe, Iſa. 42. 19. much leſſe when the affection is good in the generall, and blemiſhed onely by ſome circumſtance. For then why may not a good title bee given as an allowance of that vvhich is good, and yet the evill be at the ſame time reproved? ſo many learned divines doe interpret that of the Midwiues, Exod. 1. 19. 20. 21. Moſes was reproved and brought to his graue for a ſinne, and yet when his death is recorded, it is ſayd that *Moſes the ſervant of the Lord died, Deut. vlt.* The Churches are ſharply reproved Rev. 2. & 3. and yet are ſtiled by the name of *Churches*, and *golden Candleſtickes*: and their miniſters who are chiefly reproved are called *Starres*. 3. *there is another reaſon rendred by Salomon of this reſtraint.* 1. *Reg.* 5. 3. 4. But the Defendant ſhould mark that one reaſon doth not exclude another. In this place of *Samuel* two reaſons are rendred, as *Tremelius* and *Iunius* note, the ſecond of which is taken (as he ſaith) from the example of *Davids* aunceſtors, vvho never vndertook any ſuch thing, becauſe they knew the calling of God vvas to be exſpected. 4. *God himſelfe commended this purpoſe of David.* 1. *King.* 8. 17. As if the ſame affection may not in divers reſpects be both commended and condemned. *But this evaſion of Mr. Hy. I paſſe over*, ſayth the Defender, *as childiſh and abſurd.* And why ſo I pray? 1. *Becauſe God himſelfe did interpret this affection for a deed.* 2. *Hee did note this deed as ſpeciall, ſaying in both reſpects, thou didſt well, that it was in thy heart.* In which words if there be any conſequence, or good ſence, then not onely Mr. Hy. his evaſion, but logick it ſelfe is childiſh and abſurd.

SECT. VIII. IX. X. XI.

IN theſe paſſages two places of Scripture are obiected, vnder the name of Mr. *Hy*: but I verily thinke Mr. *Hy* hath ſome vvrong done him in the matter. Howſoever, I will not nndertake to maintaine that theſe places are fitly alledged and urged: though by proportion the force of the argument uſed in thoſe places (*who required theſe things at your hands*) is ſtrong againſt our ceremonies. We will not imitate D. *Cary* now Biſhop of Exeter, that proved the Surplice by *the armour of light*, Rom. 13. 12. nor them that prove kneeling at the communion, and at the word Ieſus, out of the bowing of the knee of all creatures, Phil. 2. 10. nor thoſe that fetch the croſſe out of the letter *Tau. Eze.* 9. 4. Neither need the Defender pleaſe himſelfe in this, that by ſome places of Scripture the ceremonies are not condemned: it is enough if they were condemned but by one onely teſtimony of Scripture, or by one ſound argument drawne out of Scripture, though no more could be brought. But what kind of dealing is this, for him that profeſſeth a confutation principally of the Lincolne ſhire Miniſters, to paſſe by divers texts of Scripture alledged by them, and to bring forth other of an vncertaine author, never publickly propounded in any of our writings?

SECT. XII.

THe laſt place of Scripture handled in this Argument, is Ier. 7. 31. the force of which, as it pertaineth to the purpoſe in hand, is in the laſt vvords, *which I commanded them not, neither came it into my heart.* The reaſon lieth thus (to take honorable *Calvins* interpretation upon the place) *ſeing God under this title onely condemneth that which the Iewes did, becauſe hee had not commanded it them: therefore no other reaſon need be ſought for the confutation of ſuperſtition, then that they are not by commandement from God.* Now the Defendant anſwereth, *that this was a thing forbidden, and in that ſence was ſayd not to be commanded.* What is this to the purpoſe? therein lieth the ſtrength of our argument: that not to command in things that pertaine to worſhip, is all one with forbidding. *But you collect* (ſayth he) *that this was not againſt, but onely beſides the word.* It is not our collection but his owne vaine conceit. Our argument is drawne from the forme of ſpeech here uſed. See Mr. *Cartwright* in his Reply p. 48. fully clearing this poynt. *When I read this objection firſt* (ſayth he) *I wondred that in diſtinguiſhing beſides the word and againſt it, you ſimbolized ſo well with Bellarmine, in his diſtinction of mortall and veniall ſinne.* He was as it ſeemeth, in a wondring humour. But 1. why doth he not wonder not onely at our late Divines, but at *Chryſoſtome* alſo, as ſymbolizing with *Bellarmine*, vvhen he in *Gal.* 1. 8. doth ſo diſtinguiſh betwixt teaching contrary to the Goſpell, and beſide the Goſpell? Why doth he not wondringly alſo accuſe *Iunius* for ſymbolizing with *Bellarmine*, while he refuteth *Bellarmine* by this diſtinction, *contr.* 3. *l.* 4. *c.* 17. *an.* 10? it were eaſie, if needfull, to produce other honorable partners in this fault: but we need no other then perſwaders to ſubſcription, vvho haue drawne divers into this net, by telling them, that though the things they ſtand upon be beſide the word, yet they are not contrary thereunto, and that onely is affirmed by ſubſcribers. 2. Wee are not the authors of this diſtinction, but they which thereby excuſe humane inventions in Gods worſhip. Wee are conſtrained to follow and ferret them in their own holes. See Mr *Cartwr. Repl. p* 56. 3 yet if need vvere, there might be ſhewed though not a reall, yet a rationall diſtinction betwixt theſe two. 4. The Defendants anſwer doth expreſly herein ſymbolize with *Bellarmine de Pont. l* 4. *c.* 19.

For the other allegations of Scripture quoted in the Abridgement for confirmation of the ſame truth vvith the former, the

Defendant reſerreth us to Chap. 2. Sect. 2. 3. 4. 5. vvhere onely one of them is touched.

SECT. XIII.

TO many teſtimonies alledged out of the Fathers, anſwer is given, 1. *That they ſpeake not of things onely beſide the Scripture, but of things contrary: which anſwer is againe repeated under the forme of a diſtinction betwixt* Scriptura negans, *and* negata. 2. *They ſpeak not of ceremonies, but of doctrines.*

To vvhich the reply is eaſie: 1. our meaning is miſtaken, I feare, wilfully, when wee are made authours of an oppoſite diſtinction betwixt *beſide* and *againſt* in this caſe. It ſufficeth vs that *beſide* in poynts of religion, bee all one with *againſt*. 2 Though thoſe generall ſayings be applyed to doctrines in moſt of the places alledged, yet that hindereth not, but the truth of them may be taken ſo generally, as to include alſo religious ceremonies. A particular or proper concluſion may be drawne from a generall propoſition, and yet the propoſition remaine generall ſtill in the largeſt extent that it is capable of.

SECT. XIIII.

TO the teſtimonie of Tertullian de Cor. c. 2. *that is prohibited which is not permitted*, two things are likewiſe anſwered, 1. *that it maketh not againſt our ceremonies, for they are permitted:* vvhich is nothing elſe but a meere ſhift. For Tertullians meaning muſt needs bee of other permiſſion then the Defendant can chalenge to our ceremonies, though he begg the queſtion: otherwiſe there ſhould be no ſence in his words. 2. he ſayth, *Wee may bluſh to ſpeak of Tertullian in this caſe: becauſe hee profeſſeth traditions in the ſame booke*. To which I anſwer: that then all our writers may bluſh vvho alledge many things out of the fathers which they in other places gaineſay. 2. Wee bluſh not to make vſe of truth where we finde it, though error follow it at the heeles; rather let our Idolizers of the Fathers bluſh, vvhen they ſee their ſhame. Yet of this anſwer wee ſhall haue occaſion to make uſe hereafter.

SECT. XV.

IN this Section anſwer is made to ſome allegations brought out of Proteſtant Writers (not unto all vvhich the Abridgement citeth for the perfection of the Scriptures) where 1. the Defendant anſwereth for himſelfe, that his meaning was not of *matters meerly ceremoniall*. And ſo, ſay I, the meaning of our argument vvas not of ſuch meere ceremonies as the Defendant here deſcribeth in the end of this Section, if he meane by meere ceremonies mere order and decencie: but our ceremonies are of another nature, becauſe they haue doctrine or teaching in them, and therefore are doctrinall, as he pleaſeth to ſpeak, or mixt. 2. confeſſing that in one place he ſpeaketh of ceremonies, he limiteth his ſpeech to ſuch ceremonies as are made eſſentiall parts of a ſacrament, as Milke in ſtead of Wine: ſopping in of bread into the cup, and wringing in of the grape; theſe ceremonies hee accounteth doctrinall. But here I vvould faine heare a good reaſon, vvhy ſopping of the bread into the cup is more doctrinall, or more againſt the vvord, then the croſſe in baptiſme. Bread and Wine were ordained by Chriſt to a holy uſe in the Church: ſo is not the croſſe: ſopping hath ſome agreement vvith reaſon: croſſing hath none; ſopping was vſed by Chriſt himſelfe the ſame night, and at the ſame table vvhere the ſacrament was appointed: croſſing vvas never uſed by Chriſt or his Apoſtles. In ſopping there is no new materiall ſigne appointed, but a new faſhion onely of vſing the old: in croſſing a new ſigne is obtruded. So that ſopping ſeemeth to bee better then croſſing. If opinion of neceſſary uſe doth put a difference: our men can eaſily conclude in the Convocation houſe, that it is not the opinion of the Church of England, and then all will be well. If ſopping ſeeme to bee a part of the ſacrament: croſſing when it is done in the very act of ſprinkling, (as many times it is) maketh as much ſhew of bearing a part in baptiſme. But what if out of the Lords Supper, a little before, or a little after, vvhile the prayers are making vvhich belong to the Supper, there ſhould be appointed ſuch a ſopping to bee uſed of all that communicate for myſticall ſignification, I vvould know of the Defendant whether this were allowable or no by his doctrinall diſtinction? If not, vvhy ſhould he ſhew more favour to the croſſe?

In excuſing of B. *Iewel*, and D. *Whitakers*, nothing is ſayd by the Defendant, which hath not formerly been confuted.

Now it might bee here expected, that the Defendant ſhould haue ſayd ſomething concerning thoſe generall rules which God hath ſet downe in his vvord for the direction of the Church in rites and orders Eccleſiaſticall, mentioned by the Lincolne-ſhire Miniſters in this argument, p. 44. But neither here, nor in any other place of this booke, doth the Defendant ſo much as indevour to ſhew that our ceremonies are *needfull and profitable for the edification of the people, by the more comely and orderly performance of that ſervice which hee hath expreſly preſcribed in his word*. This is a main matter vrged in the Abridgement, vvithout which the ceremonies cannot be innocent in their vſe: and all that the Defendant

dant hath hitherto endevoured to anſwer is in the Abridgement brought in to other end then to proue that no ceremonies are to be brought into the Church vvithout thoſe conditions: and yet for all this, our ceremonies in this chiefe poynt are left deſtitute of all defence. If therefore all were granted which the Defendants arguments or anſwers in this booke maintaine, yet the ceremonies wil be found nocent, and to be rejected, if it be but for their unprofitableneſſe, according to that of Baſil, ἀπόςολος εἰπὼν πάντα πρὸς οἰκοδομὴν γινέσθω, οὐδὲν ἀνέχεται ποιῆσαι ἀργῶς καὶ ἀνωφελῶς.

SECT. XVI.

THE Defendant here undertaketh to proue, that God in the ſcriptures hath granted a generall licence or authoritie to all Churches, to ordaine any ceremonies that may be fit for the better ſerving of God. But what if this were granted? what is it to the purpoſe? what maketh it for our ceremonies in controverſie, except he can ſhew that they are fit for the better ſerving of God? Now this he no where undertaketh to prove, nor dare, I thinke, profeſſe ſo much in writing, without many vnwarrantable limitations.

The onely ſcripture he bringeth is, 1. *Cor*. 14. 26. 40. concerning *order* and *decencie*, a place much profaned by the patrons of our ceremonies, as ſhall be ſhewed. *This place is vſed* (ſayth he) *by Fathers and all Divines, for one and the ſame concluſion.* It is much uſed, I grant, and as much abuſed. But 1. it is not uſed by all Divines, to proue the inſtitution of ſuch ceremonies as ours lawfull. For they are much miſtaken vvhich think our ceremonies to be mere matters of order: and as for decencie, they haue been often proved to be farre from it: which of it ſelfe to every indifferent eye is more then apparant. 2. it is not uſed to this purpoſe by any that haue authoritie ſufficient to perſwade us that it will beare ſuch a concluſion, except they will ſhew us by what Logick they form their conſequence, which the Defendant is not able to doe for them. 3. This ſcripture being rightly underſtood, doth not onely not juſtifie ſuch ceremonies as ours, but plainly condemneth them. For the manifeſting of which aſſertion, becauſe it may ſeem ſtrange to thoſe eares that are accuſtomed to other ſounds, I will here diſtinctly ſet down an argument drawn out of theſe words, againſt ſuch ceremonies as ours are.

All that is left vnto the Churches liberty in things pertaining unto Gods worſhip, is to order them in comely maner. This is manifeſtly collected out of the place in queſtion: ſo the Defendant ſeemeth to grant, ſo *P. Martyr* vnderſtandeth it, as is to be ſeen in his commentarie upon 1 Sam. 14. which judgement of his is cited and approved by

D. *Whitaker de Pont p.*841. *&* 844. confirmed alſo by *Iunius* againſt *Bell.cont.*3.l.4.*c.*16.*n* 86.87.*&c.*17.*n.*9.10.12.13. where he ſheweth that Chriſt is the onely law-giver that appointeth things in his Church: and that he hath appointed all that are requiſite: and that the Church maketh no lawes (properly ſo called) to appoint any new things to be uſed, but onely canons, orders, directions, ordering in ſeemly maner thoſe things which Chriſt hath appointed: and that if ſhe addeth any thing of her own, ſhe doth decline. The reaſon is, becauſe unto her is commited no authoritie of appointing new things, but a miniſterie to obſerve and doe ſuch things which Chriſt hath appointed. *vide etiam Iun. de tranſl. imper. l.*1.*c.*2.*n.*26.27. 31. This is alſo confirmed by ſound reaſon, both in reſpect of the wiſdome required in all law-makers, & perfectly found in Chriſt, and alſo in regard of the nature of ſuch inſtitutions. For the former reaſon teacheth, (as *Ariſtotle* ſheweth *Rhet.* 1. 3.) that all which poſſibly may, ſhould be appointed in the law by the giuer of it, and nothing left unto the miniſterial iudges, but that which muſt needs be left, as matters of fact, &c. Now in the worſhip of God, all but particular circumſtances of order, may eaſily bee appointed (as in very deed they were) by our law-giver Chriſt. As for the nature of ſuch inſtitutions, that doth alſo require ſo much: for whatſoever is aboue civilitie therein, if it bee not a circumſtance of order, it is worſhip, and therfore invented by man, unlawfull will-worſhip. For vvhatſoever is uſed or acted by him that worſhippeth God, in that act, it muſt needs be either grounded on civill humane conſiderations, and therefore civilitie: or an act and means of worſhip, and therfore worſhip: or the ordering and manner of diſpoſing thoſe acts & meanes, and therefore lawfull, if lawfully and fitly applyed: or elſe, at the leaſt, idle and vaine, and therefore to be avoided, according to that of Baſil, οὐ χώραν δὲ τὰ περιττὰ ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ θεοῦ: A fift cannot be given. By all this it may appeare, that the authority of the Church is not to appoint what ſhe will, no not of things in their own nature indifferent, and ſay they be in order, or for order: but onely to order thoſe things vvhich God hath appointed.

Thus farre the propoſition, or firſt part of my ſyllogiſme: the aſſumption followeth.

But to appoint & uſe the ceremonies as we doe, is not to order in comely manner any thing pertaining to Gods worſhip. The reaſon is, becauſe order requireth not the inſtitution or uſage of any new thing, but onely the right placing and diſpoſing of things which are formerly inſtituted. This appeareth 1. by the notation which is given of the word it ſelfe, which both in greek & latine is taken from the ranking of ſoldiers in certain bounds & limits of time & place. *Dicebāt enim militibus tribuni, hactenus tibi licet, hic conſiſtes, eò progrediere, huc*

reverteri

vebertere, ὅρον δῶ, *inde ordo Scalig.* and 2 by the definitions which are given therof, by Philoſophers and Divines. *Tull. off. lib.* 1 *eadem vis videtur ordinis & collocationis. Ordinem definiunt compoſitionem rerum aptis & accommodatis locis. Locum autem actionis, opportunitatem dicunt eſſe temporis. Aug. de civit. lib.*15 *cap.*13 *order is the diſpoſition which fit places to things equall and unequall, id eſt*, when things are handſomely ranked, ſome to goe before, and ſome to follow, as P.Martyr expoundeth it, loc.com.cl.4 c.5.

3 The ſame alſo is confirmed by our Divines, vvho uſually giving inſtances of *order*, doe inſiſt in time, place, and ſuch like circumſtances, making a difference betwixt myſticall ceremonies and order, many times condemning the one, and allowing the other: as the divines of France and the low Countries, in their obſervations on the Harmonie of Confeſſions *Sect.* 17 *Beza Ep.* 8. *Iun. in Bell. append. tract. de cultu imaginum c.*7 *n.*12 13 14.

4 By the context of the Chapter, *viz.* 1 Cor. 14. it plainly appeareth, that order is oppoſed to that confuſion ſpoken of v. 33, and therfore importeth nothing but that peaceable proceeding vvhereby they that ſhould ſpeak, ſpeak one by one, and the reſt attend, &c. v 30 31. So *Baſil* expoundeth it, ſhewing order to conſiſt in ſorting of perſons, ſome to this, and ſome to that according to their office, and in determining of time and place, ἀσκητ: p.459. Ερωτ: κδ. πάντα εὐσχημόνως καὶ κατὰ τάξιν γινεσθω, ἐκείνην λογιζόμεθα εὐσχήμονα εἶναι διαγωγὴν καὶ εὔτακτον ἐν τῇ συναφείᾳ τῶν πιστῶν, ἐν ᾗ ὁ τῶν μελῶν τοῦ σώματος διασώζεται λόγος. and p. 530. Ερωτ: σλη. πάντα εὐσχημόνως καὶ κατὰ τάξιν γινέσθω: ὥστε δεῖ μᾶλλον τῆς εὐσχημοσύνης καὶ τῆς εὐταξίας φροντίζειν κατὰ τὸ καιρὸν καὶ τόπον.

Laſtly, neither Luk. 1 8, neither in any place of Scripture doth the word *order* import any more then hath been ſaid.

As for comelineſſe, that is nothing but the ſeemlineſſe of order. For as *P. Martyr* ſaith in 1 Cor. 11: it is ſuch a tempering of actions as vvherby they may more fitly atteine their end. Otherwhere it may conteine that natural or civill handſomeneſſe, which is ſpoken of ch. 11 13, as it doth ch. 12 23, and ſo includeth all that which is grounded on civility, as a faire cloth and cup for the communion, a faire and firme veſſell for baptiſme: but not the appointing of new myſticall ceremonies, for then ſuch ceremonies were here commanded to all Churches, vvhich the Def. I think vvill not ſay: and then the Apoſtolick Aſſemblies ſhould haue worſhipped God uncomelily.

Thus we haue both propoſition and aſſumption of our Argument againſt the ceremonies confirmed out of this place, which the Defendant chooſe as the onely place that could be brought for them. Now I hope vve may adde the Concluſion.

Therefore to appoint and uſe the ceremonies as we doe, is not left to the liberty of the Church, i.e. it is unlawfull.

SECT. XVII.

COncerning the Fathers vve are told out of Zanchius, *that they had alwaies ſome univerſall ceremonies, as certaine feaſt daies, not appointed by God.* To this vve anſwer, 1 If this *alwaies* bee taken in the largeſt extent, to ſignifie from *the beginning*, wee cannot beleeue the truth of this Aſſertion: neither can the Defend. proue it. Who can think, that preſently upon the Apoſtles departure, their diſciples ſhould preſume to be vviſer then their Maſters? 2 the firſt beginning of theſe feaſts, vvas not by canonicall impoſition to binde men unto new ceremonies, but a voluntarie accommodation in reſpect of the infirmity of ſome in the Church, or comming towards it. This appeareth by the variety vvhich was betwixt one Church and another in obſerving of them; and by the teſtimonie of *Socrates*, alledged and allowed by this Defend. himſelfe, Apol. p. 2 lib. 2 c. 9. 3 The miſchiefe that came in by theſe obſervations, in that they ſo ſoone overſhadowed, obſcured, and juſtled out of dores the ſimplicitie of the Goſpell, and many ordinances of Chriſt, do ſufficiently ſhew, that the fathers in theſe things had neither direction nor bleſſing from God.

But that which the ancient Churches of Chriſt did alwaies maintaine may not be deemed to derogate from the authority of holy Writ. If *alwayes* include the Apoſtolicall times, I grant. If otherwiſe, then let the Def. take to himſelfe that vvhich he unreaſonably caſt upon us before, of ſymbolizing with *Bellarmine con* 1 *l* 4. *c.* 9. The ſame anſwer which our Divines giue there, will ſerue here. Wherunto may be added that vvhich M. *Parker* hath in his book of the Croſſe, p. 2 ch. 9 ſ. 6 and *de Polit. Eccleſ. l.* 2.

SECT. XVIII.

FOr Proteſtant Divines, *Bellarmines* confeſſion is alledged, who ſaith, *That Proteſtants grant that the Apoſtles did ordaine certaine Rites and Orders, belonging to the Church, which are not ſet down in Scripture, cont.* 1. *lib* 4 *cap.* 3. To vvhich I anſwer, 1 Rites and Orders may be ordained, though ſuch ceremonies as ours be unlawfull. And *Bellarmines* meaning could not be of ſuch Rites as our Ceremonies are, except he ſpake againſt his conſcience, for he confeſſeth, *de cult: ſanct. l.* 3 *cap.* 7, that ſome of our Divines, as *Brentius* by name condemne ſuch as unlawfull. 2 *Bellarmine* craftily bringeth in this confeſſion of our diviues, that he may make them contradict themſelues, as appeareth in the ſame place. His Confeſſion therefore in this place is not ſo indifferent, as the Def. would haue it: 3 our Argument is not from the Scriptures negatiuely againſt the authority of the Apoſtles, which vvas all one with that of the Scriptures, and therefore underſtood in our Propoſition, but againſt the ordinarie authority of the Church. Except therfore the Def. can proue either that our ceremonies vvere the rites brought in by the Apoſtles, or that our Convocation houſe hath the ſame authority vvhich the Apoſtles had, this confeſſion of *Bellarmine* is nothing to the purpoſe.

SECT. XIX.

HEre the Proteſtants themſelues are brought in confeſſing as much as *Bellarmine* ſaid of them. But the firſt witneſſe *Chemnitius* ſaith nothing, but that ſome Eccleſiaſticall rites, though they haue no commandement or teſtimonie in Scripture are not to be rejected: vvhich in the ſenſe now often expounded, I willingly grant. Yet the Def. ſhould not in ſtead of *Teſtimonie* of Scripture, haue put *Warrant* of Scripture: For *teſtimonie* neither in uſuall acception, nor yet in *Chemnitius* his own meaning, is ſo large as *Warrant*.

The place of *Calvin* hath been anſwered before. *Iunius* is plainly of the ſame minde, and ſo to be interpreted, ſo alſo *Zanchius*, *Daneus* and *Whitaker*: But becauſe *Iunius* is ſtiled here by the Def. vvith his deſerved title of *Iudicious*, it will not be amiſſe to ſhew his judgement fully about ſuch additions as our ceremonies are. To name therefore one place for all at this time, becauſe there he ſpeaketh profeſſedly his judgement, and bindeth it with a ſolemn oath, for the ſincerity and impartialneſſe of his conſcience in that behalfe: The place I meane is in his *Eccleſiaſticus, lib.* 3 *cap.* 5 towards the end. Where firſt he diſtinguiſheth betwixt things *neceſſarie*, and others *not neceſſarie* in the adminiſtration of the Church: and concerning even the latter ſort, he modeſtly, but throughly ſheweth how little libertie is left unto men. *If any man* (ſaith he) *either by Civill or Eccleſiaſticall authority will adde things not neceſſarie nor agreable to order, wee would not pertinaciouſly contend with him, but deſire onely that he would ſeriouſly conſider of three things.* 1 *By what authority or example he is led to thinke that the holy Church of God, and the ſimplicity of the myſteries of Chriſt (whoſe voyce onely is*

Iunius here ſpeaketh to our Defen. who pag. 3. calleth his ceremonies *The garments of Religion.*

heard by his ſheep, according to the commandement of the Father, Ioh. 10 27) *muſt be clad with humane traditions, which Chriſt doth reject ? 2 To what end he judgeth that his things ſhould be added unto thoſe that are divine ? For if the end be conformitie with others, it were more equitie, that other Churches ſhould conforme to thoſe which come neereſt to the word of God, as* Cyprians *counſell is, then that theſe ſhould conforme to the other. If the end be comelineſſe, what is more comely then the ſimplicity of Chriſt ? what is more ſimple then that comelineſſe? If there be no other reaſon beſide will, then that of* Tertullian *is to be thought of, the will of God is the chiefe neceſſitie, and that the Church of God is not tyed unto mans wills in things divine. The* 3 *thing to be thought on is, what event alwaies hath followed upon humane Traditions, as daily experience doth ſhew.*

This vvas the judgement of Iudicious *Iunius*, vvherby it is manifeſt that he favoured not our ceremonies, nor would haue pleaded for them as the Def. under colour of his name.

Becauſe *Zanchius* alſo is brought in with his deſerved Title of a *profound* Divine, ſpeaking nothing to the purpoſe in hand, I will ſet down his judgement concerning this point, out of that Epiſtle to famous Qu. *Elizabeth*, vvhere he treateth expreſly of ceremonies, and of our ceremonies. *Eſt autem Eccleſia ſicut in doctrina, ſic etiam in ceremoniis ad Eccleſiæ Apoſtlicæ regulam informanda.* The Church muſt be ordered by the rule of the Apoſtolicall Church, as vvell in ceremonies as in doctrine. What can be ſaid more contrarie to the Def. his diſtinction?

SECT. XX.

AT length vve are come to *Reaſon*. But if this reaſon were ſound and certaine, I ſee no cauſe vvhy it ſhould not haue had the upper hand of humane teſtimonies.

1 The firſt reaſon is grounded on the Defendants phantaſie meerly. For it ſuppoſeth that vve hold ſome points of Religion to be onely beſides the Word, and no vvay againſt it: vvhich not onely I haue confuted before as a cavill, but M. *Cartwright* long ſince in his Reply, p. 56: the very vvords alſo of this argument which the Def. here oppoſeth doe ſhew that vvee hold ſuch things *condemned* by the Scriptures, and therefore againſt the generall rule of them, though onely beſide their particular preſcription.

2 The ſecond reaſon concludeth nothing vvhich we will not grant, in the ſenſe formerly expreſſed, *viz.* that by thoſe ſome ceremonies be meant circumſtances of meere order, and by mans invention, be underſtood mans particular determination. Otherwiſe

wiſe the aſſumption is palpably falſe. Beſide the propoſition alſo is untrue, if (ἀδιαφορον) *a thing indifferent*, be taken in ſuch a generall ſenſe as ſome time it is found uſed in by Divines. *Vide Sopingii Apologet. reſponſ. ad lib. anonym. p.* 166.

3 The third and laſt reaſon is taken from the difference of ceremonies vvhich may and muſt be in the Churches of Chriſt. The anſwer is, that this difference ought to bee onely in determination of particular circumſtances of order, for time, place, &c.

SECT. XXI.

THis ſect. is of al other moſt ridiculous. For, firſt it ſuppoſeth every circūſtance to be of the like nature with the ceremonies in controverſie. Secondly, it ſuppoſeth all circumſtances to be of inſtitution. Thirdly, it ſuppoſeth contrary circumſtances ceremoniouſly to be practiſed, by the ſame men as of inſtitution: for otherwiſe the cavillation hath no ſhew. Now all theſe are conceited dreames. But vvhat if vve ſhould argue thus? You ſay theſe ceremonies are divine: and yet dare not deny but the rejecting of them in other Churches is divine. You retaine theſe ceremonies as divine, and yet haue rejected other ceremonies of like nature as divine as theſe. What divinitie is in ſuch courſes?

SECT. XXII.

AFter al this adoe about the propoſition of the firſt argument, now vve are told of an aſſumption out of the Abridgment, and M. *Hy. viz.* that *theſe Ceremonies haue no Warrant from the Word of God.* For M. *Hy.* I cannot ſay much: But I am ſure the Authors of the Abridgement haue great vvrong done them. Whoſoever vvill turne to the place quoted by the Def. in the Abridgement, ſhall preſently ſee that the words vvhich our Def. hath turned into a Propoſition, are there but part of an illuſtration belonging to this Propoſition, *All ceremonies that ſwerue from the rules given in the Word for the Churches direction in matters of ceremonie, are unlawfull,* The aſſumption of vvhich is, *but the ceremonies in queſtion ſwerue from thoſe Rules.* Now all the chiefe pith both of propoſition and aſſumption is by the Def. omitted: a by thing is put in place of the propoſition, a new aſſumption is formed: and yet, all fatherd upon the Abridgment. But to paſſe by that, the aſſumption here ſet down is defenſable enough.

He telleth us that *in generall and in permiſſiue appointment, theſe ceremonies are from God, and divine.* A *permiſſive appointment*, I never heard of before, nor can underſtand how it vvill be excuſed from an implicit contradiction. But for the explaining of himſelfe, he bringeth *Calvin* affirming that ſome conſtitutions of the Church founded in Scripture, may be called divine, becauſe they are parts of that decencie vvhich God hath commanded. All which being granted, and the like ſaying of *Vrſin*, maketh nothing at all for ſuch ceremoniess as ours are, except the Def. can proue, that they are conſtitutions of meer order and decencie, agreeable alſo to the other rules preſcribed: the contrary whereof hath been formerly declared. One rule of direction vvhich he calleth equity, is heere onely touched, and commeth after to be handled, to vvhich place I reſerue it.

Thus much for the maintenance of that Argument which the Def. maketh the firſt.

CHAP. II. SECT. I.

THIS ſecond Argument is taken from the kind, unto vvhich ſuch ceremonies as ours are, doe in their nature belong, *viz.* that they are parts of divine worſhip, and therefore (being mans inventions) unlawfull. Heere the Def. comes out with a *wedge* as he calleth it, diſtinguiſhing betwixt *proper* or *eſſentiall* parts of Gods worſhip, and *improper* or *accidentall*. But firſt he ſhould haue done vvell to haue conſidered the nature and meaſure of the thing which he vvould cleaue, by the light of a definition. For otherwiſe he may ſpend his wedge, his beetle, and all his labour in vaine.

And ſo indeed he hath, as may appeare by his explication of this diſtinction. *By proper and eſſentiall parts* (ſaith he) *we underſtand ſuch ceremonies, which are ſo neceſſarily required to Gods ſervice, as that the contrarie thereof muſt needs diſpleaſe him. By accidentall parts* (or appurtenances) *ſuch as ſerue onely as acceſſorie complements, ordained for the more convenient diſchaige of the neceſſarie worſhip of God, i.e. for decorum and edification.* For 1 if all thoſe ceremonies be eſſentiall parts of Gods worſhip, vvhich are ſuch as the contrarity of them muſt needs diſpleaſe God, then certainely all ceremonies vvhich ſerue for *decorum* and *edification* muſt needs be eſſentiall parts of Gods worſhip: becauſe the contrarie of *decorum* and *edification* muſt needs diſpleaſe God in his worſhip. 2 What kind of wedging is this, ſo to diſtinguiſh the parts of Gods worſhip, as that the accidentall onely, and not the eſſentiall ſhall ſerue for edification? 3 What cleaving or diſſolving is this of the parts of worſhip, where the accidentall parts are rather ſaid to bee appurtenances then parts, and yet granted to be parts? 4 What worſhip of God is there that is not eſſentiall? If it hath no eſſence of vvorſhip in it, ſurely it is no vvorſhip. 5 The accidentall parts of worſhip haue not ſo much communion vvith the eſſentiall, as the *haire* of the bodie (vvhich is but an excrement) hath vvith the bodie: this the Def. expreſly granteth in this Sect. and ſhall that which is not ſo much as an excrement unto the chiefe vvorſhip, be accounted or called a part of worſhip.

SECT. III.

FOr the proofe of this, that *no humane inventions are lawfull parts of Gods worſhip*, the Abridgement alledgeth *Exod.* 20 4. *Deut.* 12 32 *Eſ.* 1 12 *Mat.* 15 9 *Col.* 2 23, three of which are onely mentioned by the Def. and two of the three onely anſwered, or rather put of with miſerable ſhifts? *By the precepts of men Eſ.* 29 9 *are ſignified* (ſaith he) *ſuch humane ordinances as were expreſly contrary to the commandements of God.* But 1 if here he taketh the word *expreſly* as oppoſite unto *pregnant conſequence*, as he doth p. 2 then I hope he will grant that there is the ſame reaſon of thoſe humane inventions which are not expreſly contrary. If he taketh it largely, as conteining ſuch conſequence, then he ſaith nothing to the purpoſe, becauſe in that ſenſe all Religious vvorſhip invented by man is expreſly contrary to the commandements of God. 2 Chriſt himſelfe Mat. 15 9, doth interprete this very place of vvil-worſhip in generall, where for brevity ſake, I refer the Def. unto M. *Calvin* whom he calleth an honourable Witneſſe in this controverſie. He after long diſcourſe concludeth thus, *fixum ergo illud maneat, fictitios omnes cultus coram deo vanos eſſe: imo, teſte propheta maledictos & deteſtabiles, i. e.* This muſt be held for certaine, that all vvorſhips invented by man are before God, vaine, accurſed and deteſtable. *By adding and diminiſhing Deut.* 12 32 *is not meant* (ſaith the Def.) *addition of preſervation, but addition of corruption.* Where 1 the phraſe is ſtrange, *by adding and diminiſhing is meant addition.* 2 This gloſſe is cleane contrarie to the text, for the Lord chargeth that we doe not adde to the word, that ſo we may keep or preſerue it Deu. 4 2 even as we keep or preſerue carefully that which is committed to our truſt 1 Tim. 6 20: now the Def. telleth us that ſome addition is the meanes of keeping or preſervation. Card. *Cajetan* himſelfe interpreteth the place far more judiciouſly and religiouſly, *inhibetur additio etiam pretextu cuſtodiendi mandata Dei*, even of additions that are pretended for preſervation of Gods law, com. in *Deu.* 10. 3 He ſhould haue done well to haue manifeſted unto us the addition of preſervation by ſome example: for that which he talketh of the coyner pertaineth onely to *corruption*, of vvhich no man doubteth. 4 I would know if there be not alſo a diminution of preſervation, as well as an addition? in the text they are joyned together. 5 This pretence vvas the old ſhoeing-horne to draw on ſuperſtition into the Church, as *Calvin* noteth on Mat. 15 2, *Legiſlatores ipſi non jactabant ſe novum quicquā tradere, ſed tantum addere cavendi formulas, quæ media eſſent adminicula ad ſervandam Dei legem*, i.e. *the old Maſters of ceremonies pretended that they meant only to bring in additions of preſervation*. 6 This is *Bell.* anſwer to *Calvin* concerning this very point and place, *de effect. ſacr. l. 2 c. 32 prohibet dominus additionem corrumpentem*, i.e. as the Def. tranſlateth, *an addition of corruption is forbidden*. This I hope is another manner of ſymbolizing with *Bellar.* then that vvhich the Def. formerly objected to Non-conformiſts.

SECT. IIII.

Here are two teſtimonies brought to confute the Non-conf. his interpretation of Scripture, wherby he would infer that all kinde of will-worſhip is unlawfull. For that is here the queſtion and nothing elſe. The firſt Witneſſe is *Danæus*, where the conſequence lyeth thus, if *Danæus* in one place doth apply theſe Scriptures to groſſer will-worſhip then our is, then he doth not allow that they condemne all kind of wil-worſhip; but the firſt is true: *ergo*. Is not this a faire kinde of reaſoning: juſt as the Papiſt *Gregorius de Valentia* reaſoneth, abominable idolatry is condemned, 1 Pet. 4. 3, therfore not all idolatry.

The other Witneſſe is *Zanchius* in Col. 2 23, where beſide that the like conſequence is made as before, I would deſire any indifferent man to conſider theſe vvords of *Zanchie* found in that verie place. *One kind of wil-worſhip is if any new worſhip, wherby God is worſhipped be invented and brought into the Church. For God will onely be worſhipped, and onely with that worſhip which he himſelfe hath appointed, Deut. 6 Mat. 15*, allſo, thoſe in 1 *Theſ.* 1 9. *By an idol in generall is meant whatſoever in Religion is brought in without the word of God.* He that looketh upon theſe words of *Zanchie*, will ſcarce tell what to think of this Def. his audacious alledging of this Author, and the vaine triūph which he groundeth upon him. He thought it ſeemeth that few or none would ever take the paines to examine what he ſaid.

In the fift Section, there is nothing on either ſide but a dumb ſhew. It ſhall paſſe for me therfore in ſilence.

SECT. VI.

Heere come the judgment of Proteſtants to be examined concerning this queſtion, *Whether all parts of Divine worſhip invented by man be not to be condemned?* Where firſt the Defendant bringeth forth his wedge again, diſtinguiſhing betwixt eſſentiall, and accidentall worſhip as before: but in other phraſes;

for now he telleth us, that *eſſentiall worſhip is that wherein is placed an opinion of juſtice, ſanctitie, efficacie, or divine neceſſitie : and accidentall is any rite, which ſerveth for the more conſonant and convenient diſcharge of that eſſentiall worſhip*. But theſe are but words. For 1. worſhip doth not varie according to mens opinion : but conſiſteth in the nature of the action it ſelfe. Otherwiſe a man may goe to Maſſe, conceiving a privat opinion to himſelfe, that he doth it not for juſtice, ſanctity, efficacie, or divine neceſſity, but for ſome other cauſe. Or at the leaſt a convocation houſe may appoint us the groſſeſt of all the ceremonies in Poperie, and ſet another opinion upon it. 2. Sanctitie cannot be ſeparated vvholly from ſuch ceremonies vvhich are proper unto religion. i. appropriated unto religious perſons, actions, and purpoſes onely, in the ſolemne vvorſhip of God. For they muſt either be holy, or civill, or prophane. But civill they are not; for then the bare omiſſion of them vvould argue rudeneſſe and incivilitie : nor prophane, I hope, in the Def. opinion : therefore they muſt needs be holy. 3. There is no judicious Divine that uſeth to call circumſtances of meere order and decencie, *worſhip*. Where did the Def. ever read that a pulpit, or a table, or a faire cloath, &c. was pronounced or ſtiled vvorſhip ?

Come vve therefore to the examination of witneſſes in particular. *Calvins words* are, Inſtit. l. c. 10. ſect. 8. *all humane conſtitutions, in which the worſhip of God is placed, are ungodly.* The Def. ſayth, that 1. *Calvin meaneth not by worſhip circumſtances of order.* Which is moſt true, neither was any reader ſo ſottiſh, as ever tooke that to be his meaning. For vvhat ſence could there be in theſe words, *all humane conſtitutions, in which the circumſtances of order are placed?* 2. He telleth us that he meaneth *the inward vertue of worſhip, which conſiſteth in an opinion of holineſſe and juſtice.* Where firſt I will not urge or grate upon the ill ſound which theſe words have, *the inward vertue of worſhip conſiſteth in an opinion.* 2. How can an inward vertue be placed in an outward ceremonie? 3. The proper nature of worſhip is not in holineſſe and juſtice, but in the honouring of God : and all externall ceremonies vvhoſe proper uſe is the honouring of God, are externall vvorſhip, as all diuinitie ſheweth. This is therefore but an idle unlearned evaſion, to talk of holineſſe, and juſtice, in opinion, vvhen the queſtion is of vvorſhip. *Calvin* never thought of ſuch toyes. He amplifieth indeed his accuſation againſt the Papiſts by ſuch circumſtances as thoſe are, according as the Def. ſheweth : but what Logick can thence conclude, that nothing elſe is conteined in the generall rule ? *Calvin* himſelfe profeſſeth the contrary, as directly as if he had undertaken to confute this defender of ceremonies. For theſe are his words, Epiſt. 259. *Si probe & penitus inſpicitur, quid homines tantopere ſolicitet ad fabri-*

candas ceremonias, reperiemus ex hoc fonte omnes fluxiſſe, quia quiſq; novum Dei cultum fingere auſus fuerit: atqui fictitios omnes cultus non modo repudiat Deus, ſed etiam ſevere abominatur. i. *The originall of all ceremonies was, that men would needs forge new worſhips of God: whereas God doth not onely refuſe ſuch worſhips, but alſo abhorreth them.*

For *Chemnitius*, the Defendant telleth us that hee condemneth onely a ceremony which is among the Papiſts made *neceſſarie*. But he ſhould ſhew two things if hee would anſwer ſoundly: 1 that *Chemnitius* doth diſtinguiſh, as he doth, of will worſhip, as ſome were lawfull, and ſome onely unlawfull. 2. hee ſhould ſhew us at the leaſt, that there is ſome vvorſhip which is not neceſſarie: for otherwiſe *Chemnitius* in condemning will-worſhip that is impoſed as neceſſarie, doth condemne all wil-worſhip. Now we in our ſimple divinitie (for ſo it will be accounted) conceiue thus: All worſhip of God is that honour, dutie, and reverence vvhich the reaſonable creature doth owe to the creator: and therfore cannot underſtand, how ſuch a dutie is not neceſſary to be performed: or how there can be a vvorſhip, which being part of this tribute, may reſt in mans choyce vvhether it ſhall be paid or no. Perhaps this neceſſitie pertaineth onely to the vvorſhip commanded by God: but in that vvhich man diviſeth of himſelfe, there is more libertie, there being no reaſon, that voluntary ſervice ſhould be conſtreined. If this be the cauſe, then the vvorſhip appointed by man, is no part of his love towards God, nor any teſtification of it. For if it vvere, ſurely it ſhould be neceſſarie, ſeeing it is neceſſary to loue God vvith all our hearts, vvith all our ſoules, and vvith all our ſtrength.

The third vvitneſſe is *P. Martyr, loc. com.* 770. vvhere he ſayth, concerning things in their own nature indifferent, that *ſpeciall care muſt be had, leſt any ſuch thing be thought to make towards the worſhip of God, becauſe divine worſhip dependeth not on mans will, but on Gods counſell.* A man vvould think that theſe vvords are plaine enough for the condemning of all vvil-vvorſhip. *True* (ſaith the Def.) *he verifieth your phraſe of ſpeech, but not your ſence.* And vvhy ſo? becauſe (forſooth) *he ſayth in the ſame place, that the Church may appoynt circumſtances of order*: as if there were any among us that ever denied this: *therefore he condemneth not the inſtitution of accidentall parts of Gods worſhip.* Let any man of ſence give judgement here: *P. Martyr* ſayth, *it is lawfull to appoint circumſtances of order, but unlawfull to appoint any worſhip.* The Def. thus: *P. Martyr alloweth men to appoynt circumſtances of order, therefore he alloweth them to appoynt ſome worſhip.* If this be not as plain a contradiction as any can bee framed, then (according to the proverb) let him that taught me logick, give me my money againe, *Reddat minam Diogenes.*

In the laſt place (as thoſe which make a feaſt uſe to do) D. *Morton* ſetteth down himſelfe. But he may be accuſed though for ſitting down too ſoon: for in the Abridgm. I find *Melancthon, Bullinger, Bucanus, Perkins* and others invited to this meeting, vvho now by this haſtineſſe of the Def. can find no place. Yet let us heare what he ſayth for himſelfe. *I do not* (ſayth he) *condemne all the ceremonies of Rome, but the multitude and burthen of them.* To vvhich I anſwer, 1. the queſtion is not here how many or how few you condemned of the Romiſh ceremonies: but by vvhat reaſon you condemned them. He that condemneth one ceremonie becauſe it is a vvorſhip of mans deviſing, condemneth all vvorſhip that man deviſeth: and he that condemneth a multitude in that name, condemneth one that is ſuch, though it bee alone. 2. Becauſe I haue heard men often ſpeak in this maner of the fault that is in a multitude, I would willingly know, vvhat certaine limits and bounds are ſet by Gods law, for the number of humane ceremonies, ſuch as now are in controverſie. If there may be three, vvhy not foure, fiue, ſixe, and ſo forth, as many as it ſhall pleaſe the convocation houſe, or him that can vvhen he vvill turne the convocation upſide downe? ſurely, if once vve depart from Gods inſtitution, there vvill be no place to reſt our foot in, but vve muſt ever follow wind and tide, vvhich in religion is baſeneſſe it ſelfe.

SECT. VII.

HEre is promiſed a confutation of the propoſition, viz. of this aſſertion, *all Will-Worſhip Whatſoever is to be condemned,* and to that purpoſe he bringeth forth againe his *Magna Charta, Let all things be done in order.* But I think that plea is ſufficiently confuted. In the next place he produceth or rather as the fellow ſayd once, ſeduceth 2 vvitneſſes, *Vrſine* and *Zanchie.* But beleeue me, when I looked vpon the places vvhich he alledgeth out of them, I could not but lift up my heart unto God, and ſay, O Lord, how can ſuch conceited confidence faſten on a man that regardeth either conſcience or credit? How dare mortall men upon ſuch grounds as theſe, obtrude the conception of their braines upon thy, Churches? *Vrſine* (ſaith the Def.) *hath catechiſed them wel.* True: but our proud Prelats for the moſt part, do ſcorne not onely that, but all other catechiſmes, except for faſhion ſake, that vvhich beginneth with *What is your name?* and though I doe not account this Def. in that number, yet I may ſafely ſay, that hee never vvell conſidered vvhom or vvhat he cited out of *Vrſine*. All that he bringeth, is out of the commentary on q. 96. ob. 3. & 5. as it is ſet downe by *Pareus.* Now before obiections be brought, it is fit and uſuall that the *Theſis* or ſentence be ſet down againſt vvhich thoſe objections fight; and no vviſe man will take up an anſwer made to an obiection, before hee conſidereth the aſſertion againſt vvhich that objection is made. See then vvhat the aſſertion of *Vrſine* is: *Ipſæ ceremoniæ (Eccleſiaſticæ ſc. quæ ab hominibus præcipiuntur) non modo cultus Dei non ſunt: ſed etiam conſcientias non obligant, &c.* the very ſame thing vvhich we here maintaine, viz. that no lawfull ceremonies appointed by man, are the worſhip of God. Except therefore Eccleſiaſticall ceremonies be therefore the vvorſhip of God, becauſe they be not the worſhip of God, the Def. had no reaſon to alledge this place of *Vrſin* in this queſtion: and ſo iuſt it is in the vvords here alledged out of the anſwer to the third objection, *thoſe things which ſerve accidentally to the glory of God, are not the worſhip of God.* And to the 4. obj. *By theſe examples wil-worſhip is not eſtabliſhed.* And to the 5. obj. *Indifferent things (being done of faith) pleaſe God otherwiſe then the worſhip of God properly ſo called.* Is it poſſible that any thing ſhould be concluded from hence for vvill-worſhip? Surely no: and therfore the Def. himſelfe maketh his concluſion out of theſe premiſes, that *Divine worſhip properly ſo called is that which is ordained of God.* Was there any of us that ever doubted of this? is it not the propoſition vvhich this Def. undertook to confute. *But in a large ſence* (ſayth he) *humane ceremonies may bee held to be a part of divine worſhip.* This is that which we haue heard averred before in this ſection. I had thought we ſhould haue ſeene it proved. But alas it could be no more then affirmed, and that under the ſhadow of a ſentence whereby it is flatly condemned. *Zanchie* (ſayth he) *diſtinguiſheth the ſubſtance of worſhip from thoſe things which are annexed to worſhip.* Why ſo doe all the Non-conformiſts. What then? are ceremonies worſhip in a large ſence, becauſe they are annexed to worſhip? then the ſigne of the croſſe is a ſacrament becauſe it is annexed to a ſacrament.

I wonder (ſayth the Def.) *how ſuch poynts ſhould ſeeme to be ſo raw to ſome of the Non-conformiſts.* What poynts? thoſe aſſertions which *Vrſine* and *Zanchy* expreſſe? they ſeeme to all of us well digeſted axiomes of Divinitie: but the conſequence vvhich the Def. would draw from hence, is evidently ſo raw, that none but a very Oſtridge can concoct it.

SECT. IX

TO proue that our ceremonies are impoſed and uſed as vvorſhip, this argument is brought: *Thoſe ceremonies which haue the kinde, nature, and definition of worſhip belonging to them, ſo that they want nothing but a right author to make them true worſhip, thoſe*

thoſe are in their impoſition and uſe worſhip, and for want of a right authour, are falſe worſhip: but our ceremonies are ſuch. Ergo.

The Def. his anſwer is, that this learning never ſaw print, as he thinketh, *that the inſtitution of God doth not alter the common nature of worſhip.* 1. It may be that hee never ſaw it in print: but I can witneſſe, that Mr. *William Bradſhaw*, a man that knew how to frame an argument in logicall manner, as well as any Biſhop in England, ſet this reaſon down in Print ſome 14 yeares ſince, in one edition (as I remember) of his treatiſe concerning indifferent things. But an anſwer to that treatiſe, or to this argument, was never yet ſeene in print, though that begging of the queſtion be the chiefe ground of thoſe invectiues vvhich are ordinarily uſed in Sermons and vvritings about theſe queſtions, viz. that they are things indifferent. This argument is alſo found in a treatiſe of the ſame authors, concerning *Divine worſhip*, printed 1604. 2. Though it had never ſeen the print before now, yet that doth not hinder, but it may be ſound. For all ſound reaſons are not found in print. 3. There is none of our Divines that treateth of vvorſhip in generall and particular, but hath for ſubſtance this learning, viz. that religious worſhip is that which is done to the honour of God: and if it bee according to Gods commandement, then it is true; if not, then it is falſe. The Def. cannot name one of all that ever handled the common place of *worſhip*, that hath not ſo taught, which if it be true, then the inſtitution of God doth not alter the common nature of vvorſhip: i. it doth not make that vvorſhip which otherwiſe being uſed to ſome end, and in the ſame manner, without Gods inſtitution, vvere no worſhip at all.

But *Gods inſtitution* (ſayth the Def.) *doth diſtinguiſh neceſſary worſhip from indifferent, and eſſentiall from accidentall.* Grant all this: what can be made of it? Doth it therefore alter the common nature of worſhip, making that worſhip, vvhich without it being uſed in the ſame manner, and to the ſame end, is no worſhip? here is no conſequence at all. Beſide, neither ſcripture, nor interpreters of Scripture, nor any good reaſon will allow, that there is any *indifferent* worſhip of God. Neither is it the inſtitution of God (common to all worſhip) which maketh one more, and another leſſe principall: but the nature of the thing inſtituted by him.

But *the offering of any coloured ſheep was indifferent before the Leviticall law: afterward, the offering of an unſpotted lamb, was neceſſarie and eſſentiall in the worſhip of God.* To which objection I anſwer, 1. This his oppoſition of offering any coloured ſheep before the Leviticall law, to the offering of an unſpotted lamb afterward, is vain and without ground from the law of God; ſeeing it doth no where appeare in the Scriptures, but that it was as lawfull to offer any coloured ſheep after the law given as well as before. God requires by *Moſes*, that the offerings of his people ſhould be *perfect*, *Levit.*1.3.10 &c. And this might well be notwithſtanding diverſitie of colour. The party-coloured ſheepe of *Iaakob* were not imperfect, but of the perfecteſt ſort, and that by the ſpeciall direction and bleſſing of God, *Gen.*30.41.42. *With* 31.11.12. God complaineth of thoſe that offered corrupt ſacrifices, torne, lame, and ſicke, *Mal.*1.13.14. But for difference of colour, there is little colour or ſhew of reaſon, that God gaue any ſuch charge in his law. And it is the Doctors ignorance of the ſtory, or want of due conſideration that moved him thus to write. Secondly, ſuppoſe a lambe without ſpot to be forbidden, then I anſwer, That if any man before the commandement had offered an unſpotted Lamb with the ſame mind that after it was to be offered with, as thinking that his ſacrifice ſhould in that reſpect haue been the more acceptable unto God, becauſe it was of a lamb unſpotted, then the offering of ſuch a lambe had been as eſſential worſhip before, as it was after, though it could not be ſo true and lawfull.

Did the Def. never read nor heare, that matter and forme doe uſually make up the eſſence of things? and that in inſtitutions which are means to an end, the reſpect of that end is alſo required to the being, but a right efficient not ſo? let him conſider a litle of the grounds of logick, or read our moſt logicall Divines, ſuch as *Sadeel* is, and he ſhall ſoone perceive the truth. or elſe without that labour, let him or any other of common ſence tell me, if the Temple of Ieruſalem ſhould haue been built with all the appurtenances, and ſacrifices with other obſervances there uſed, without any commandement of God, according as they vvere by his appoyntment, had there not been eſſentiall falſe worſhip erected unto God? haue the Papiſts and Heathens no eſſential falſe worſhip, but onely accidental? It is a ſhame to confute ſuch unlearned conceits.

SECT. X.

HEre are many proofes conjoyned under the name of M. *Hy.* and others: the anſwers to which are juſt ſuch as the ceremonies be, meerly formall, without eſſence or ſubſtance of truth.

The firſt is, ceremonies are impoſed to breed an opinion of holineſſe, as M. *Hooker* affirmeth, p.61. and therefore are parts of Gods worſhip. The conſequence is not denied by the Def. nor yet the antecedent directly: ſo that the vvhole argument ſeemeth to be granted, onely the Def. ſayth, that Mr. *Hooker* did not aſcribe *operative* holineſſe either *by infuſion or inheſion* (which two

tearmes

tearms are vnreaſonably by him diſ-ioyned) *but onely ſignificatiue, as his words import.* To which I anſwer, 1. that as the nice diſtinctions vvhich are now uſed in the ſchooles of Ieſuits, do not help, but that Popiſh ſuperſtition is as groſſe as ever it was in practiſe: ſo this diſtinction of *operatiue, infuſion, inhaeſion, ſignificatiue*, doth nothing helpe, but the common people in many places inclined to ſuperſtition, doe attribute as much holineſſe to ſome of theſe ceremonies, as they doe to ſome holy ordinances of God. 2. The Patrones of our ceremonies, ſuch as Mr. *Hooker* vvas, doe attribute that holineſſe to the ceremonies vvhich the Fathers did. Now that they aſcribed operatiue holineſſe unto ſome of them, Mr. *Parker* hath made plaine in his booke of the Croſſe, *Part.* 1. *p.* 77. 90 92. &c. 3. Mr. *Hooker* doth not here ſpeake of reverence ſignified by the ceremonies, but of reverence to be ſignified towards them, as being things holy and vvorthy reverence. 4 What Mr. *Hooker* aſcribed unto the croſſe, is to be ſeen in M. *Parker*, p. 91.

The ſecond reaſon is, *becauſe the ceremonies are the conſtitutions of a ſacred Synod.* The force of vvhich argument lyeth in this, that a holy Aſſembly of ſpirituall Lords and their aſſiſtants, if they bee truely holy and ſpirituall in their authoritie, and in the exerciſe of it, will appoynt no ceremonies but holy: and by the the obſervance of the ſaid ceremonies, haue ſome ſpirituall honour redounding unto themſelues, becauſe the vertue vvhich is found in any effect, doth redound alwayes unto the praiſe of the cauſe. To this the Defendant giveth no reall anſwer: onely he doth affirme (contrary to the truth) *that our Convocations may bee called ſacred, as well as the Churches of Christ Saints by calling.* Whereas beſide other differences, Churches are of God: our convocations are of man. Churches are gathered for the holy Worſhip of God: convocations (as experience ſheweth) for nothing leſſe.

The third reaſon is, becauſe *the ceremonies are appropriated to the acts of Religion in Gods ſervice.* To this the Defendant anſwereth by denying the conſequence, becauſe *the Pulpit cloth, the communion cup, and the place of meeting are ſo appropriated, and yet not eſſentially holy.* But herein he ſheweth, that he doth not underſtand well vvhat it is that he oppoſeth. For theſe things wherof he ſpeaketh, are onely civill, being drawn from the ordinary civill cuſtomes of men, and are of the ſame uſe out of the ſervice of God, that they are in it: and therefore howſoever ſome ſpeciall individuals of this kinde may be appropriated unto religious acts, yet the kinde is not: neither haue thoſe ſpecialls any other ſignification in the ſervice of God, then they haue in the ſervice of men. Theſe therefore are not ſuch ceremonies as now are in queſtion, nor ſo appropriated to religion.

The fourth confirmation is from Math. 15. vvhere ſuch ceremonies are blamed of Chriſt by this reaſon. To this the Defendant anſwereth, that *the act of waſhing is not there reproved, but the invention and opinion of an operatiue ſanctitie and holineſſe attributed unto it.* But firſt, to vvhat purpoſe doth he deny, that the act of waſhing ſimply conſidered in it ſelfe, vvas unlawfull? was there ever any ſo durtie, that hee would affirme ſuch a foule fancie? Secondly, the intention and opinion of holineſſe is that vvhich now our ceremonies are charged with. Therfore in that there is no difference. Thirdly, that the Phariſies attributed any more operatiue holineſſe unto their waſhing then many amongſt us doe to the croſſe, cannot bee ſhewed out of the Text. There is not one circumſtance there vvhich may not fitly bee applied to our ceremonies. Fourthly, not onely *Calvin* upon the place, ſayth that the inventing of ſuch ceremonies vvas an *idle vanitie*, even before the high opinion of religion vvas added vnto it: but *Bellarmine* himſelfe *De effect. ſacr. lib.* 2. *cap.* 32. confeſſeth that Chriſt reproved this ceremonie in the Phariſies, becauſe it was vaine and unprofitable.

SECT. XI.

HERE is ſet downe a reaſon of Mr. *Hy.* to proue that our Ceremonies in their uſe and practiſe are preferred and honoured aboue principall parts of Gods worſhip: becauſe the ableſt miniſters that are, may not be ſuffered to exerciſe any miniſterie in England, except they will apply themſelves to theſe Ceremonies. To this the Defendant anſwereth, *that it is dull Sophiſtry: becauſe by this meanes onely an orderly and diſcreet Preacher is preferred before one that is factious and exorbitant.*

Now, if ever, hee ſpeaketh like an Ordinarie, like a Biſhop, vvhen hee ſitteth in his *Pontificalibus*, to iudge the poore according to the Lawes of iniquitie. It ſeemeth ſome galled place of his conſcience was touched, vvhen mention was made of ſilencing able and godly miniſters for trifling ceremonies of mans invention. How much better vvere it for ſuch men to enter into their hearts betimes, and thinke vvhat anſwer they can giue unto God for ſuch palpable treacherie? But to examine a little the reaſon that is in this anſwer; under the tearme of *Dull Sophiſtrie*: hee more then denieth the conſequence of the reaſon: yet if it be rightly underſtood, all his wit will not avoyd the dint of it. For 1. thus I take the meaning, which is the practiſe: he that is an able godly miniſter, if he will not uſe theſe ceremonies, may not be ſuffered to haue place in the Miniſterie: but he that will uſe theſe ceremonies, though he may neither comparatiuely to the other, nor any thing competently by himſelfe, be either able or godly, ſhall hold his place in the Miniſterie. Therefore theſe ceremonies are preferred before the maine things of the Law and Goſpell. 2 I take it thus: though there cannot be found able & diſcreet conformable Miniſters enough to ſupply all the Pariſhes of England, yet many able and godly men are ſhut out of the Miniſterie becauſe they vvill not conforme to theſe ceremonies: therfore conformity to theſe ceremonies is preferred before the maine duties of Gods vvorſhip. If all the Defendants ſharpneſſe of wit can anſwere the bluntneſſe of this Argument, vvhich every Plowman that is a good Chriſtian doth uſually make againſt the Prelats proceedings, then I for my part will be contented to be called dull, for from my childhood hitherto I ever took it to be unanſwerable.

The compariſon of the Lord Chancellor vvill doe him no help in this caſe. For that Chancellor were unworthy of his own place, vvho would for his own pleaſure, or for the circumſtance of a place, which may eaſily be changed, put out of commiſſion a graue wiſe man, when another like unto him could not be found. Beſide the caſe is nothing like: for in the circumſtance of a place for commiſſioners to meet in, there can be no conſcience pretended. But here offer hath been made by the Miniſters thus wronged, ſolemnly to confirme by oath, that nothing but conſcience doth keepe them from conforming.

Now for the ſweet termes vvhich it pleaſeth the Def. heere to uſe, I vvill deſire no more, then that he would bring them back againe to his owne conſcience, and aske that before God, 1 whether old M. *Midſly* of Ratſdel, vvho after he had laboured neere 50 yeare in the Miniſterie to the converſion of thouſands, vvas inhumanely ſilenced by the Biſhop of Cheſter, vvere a factious and exorbitant man? and that vvhich I ſay of him becauſe he belonged to Cheſter, I underſtand of many hundreds vvhich haue in like manner been oppreſſed. No doubt the evill ſervant which is ſpoken of, Mat. 24 49, vvhen he began to beat his fellow ſervants better then himſelfe, called them factious and exorbitant fellows: but he vvith all that are like him, know better, and one day ſhall be conſtreyned to giue other witneſſe. 2 I vvould know of the Def. alſo whether all or the moſt of them vvhich are in the Miniſterie be *orderly* and *diſcreet* men in that religious meaning which belongeth to Miniſters? This I am ſure of, the voyce of all the Country goeth cleane otherwiſe. When M. *Midſly*, and his ſonne after him vvere ſilenced at Ratſdel, all that country knoweth what an orderly diſcreet Preacher came into the place. When vvorthy M. *Baines* vvas ſilenced at Cambridge, as a factious exorbitant man, there vvas, beſide many other unworthy Miniſters, one commonly called *the Vicar of hell*, vvho vvas kept in, as an orderly diſcreet Preacher. 3 If faction and exorbitancie may be charged on them that neglect a ceremonious canon upon conſcience, what name ſhall be found fit for the Prelates, vvho vvilfully, vvithout and againſt conſcience continually liue in and by the breach of many ſubſtantiall, ancient and wholeſome Canons? for this ſee M. *Parker* of the croſſe, *part. 2 c. 9 ſ. 4.*

SECT. XII.

HEre is alleaged the opinion vvhich many people in all parts of the land haue concerning our ceremonies, *viz.* that the Sacraments are not rightly & ſufficiently adminiſtred without them. To this the Def. anſwereth three things, 1 *That moſt people hold the contrarie*: 2 *That the opinion of people in obſerving doth not proue the judgement of governours in impoſing*: 3 *that it is moſt likely that thoſe people vvhich thinke ſo are brought into that conceite by the oppoſition vvhich is made againſt the ceremonies.* But firſt, I would faine know of the Defendant vvhy he paſſeth by in ſilence, not onely the teſtimony of *Chemnitius* cited by the Abridgement for confirmation of this part of the aſſumption, but alſo the paſſages of Gods vvord, and many of the beſt Divines, vvhich are alſo alledged there in the propoſition, and applyed unto this part of the aſſumption by the Authors of the Abridgement? ſurely this is not plaine dealing. Secondly, I anſwer that the opinion of a few may make that an action unlawfull, vvhich the opinion of many other cannot make lawfull, as is to be ſeen 1 Cor. 10 28, *if any man ſay unto thee*. Thirdly, it doth not appeare the moſt are otherwiſe minded. For the moſt being uſed unto the ceremonies, and not unto good teaching, may well be thought to haue the ſame opinion of humane ceremonies vvhich they haue of divine. Fourthly, the Def. forgetteth vvhat vvas to be proved in this place: for the queſtion is not onely vvhether our ceremonies be ſo impoſed, but alſo vvhether they be ſo eſteemed and obſerved, as appeareth in the Abridgement. Novv the opinion of the people proveth I hope in vvhat manner they are eſteemed and obſerved And vvhile they are ſo obſerved, they that ſtill impoſe them in thoſe places vvhere they are ſo obſerved, may truely be interpreted ſo to impoſe them. *In actions of this kinde* (ſaith Hooker l. 5 p. 165) *vvee are more to reſpect vvhat the greateſt part of men is commonly prone to conceive, then vvhat ſome few mens vvits may devize in conſtruction of* *their particular meaning.* Fiftly, the laſt conceit is ridiculous, that the oppoſing and condemning of ceremonies ſhould make men thinke that the Sacraments are not ſufficiently adminiſtred without them. *The popiſh people* (ſaith he) *haue no great conceit of our ceremonies.* Why is it then that *Gretſer*, and ſome other Ieſuits call our Prelats *Calvino-papiſtæ*, Popiſh Calviniſts? How is it that by theſe ceremonies vve are borne in hand that the Papiſts are likely to be drawn unto cõmunion vvith our Church? Whence is it that all our Church-papiſts are great maintainers of the ceremonies? *The reſt* (ſaith he) *which are not of your diſciplining are not ſo many.* O miſerable out-facing of God and man! Who hath diſciplined for this threeſcore yeares almoſt all the people of Wales? Who but the Prelates and their creatures haue had the diſciplining of all the Cathedrall Churches in England, and all the poore Pariſhes that depend upon them? Who are the Diſcipliners of all the Non-reſidents and Pluraliſts forlorne charges? and who of the many ten pound cures? Doe theſe ſeem a few in the Def. eyes?

SECT. XIII.

THe omiſſion of ceremonies is here alledged to be more ſharply puniſhed, then many great ſinnes againſt the law of God, though it be vvithout ſcandall and contempt. To this the Def. anſwereth, firſt by denying the conſequence, *viz.* that if this be ſo, then theſe ceremonies are preferred before the precepts of God, and unlawfull. But 1 vvhy ſaith he nothing to *the Churches of Germanie, to Melancton, Martyr, Chemnitius, Beza, Iunius, Lubbertus, Polanus, Bucanus, Pilkinton, Perkins, and the whole Clergie of England*, brought in as allowing of this conſequence, in the Abridgement? Are not all theſe worth one anſwer of the Defendants? 2 The reaſon that he giveth for puniſhing more ſeverely the omiſſion of a ceremony, then hainous ſins, is frivolous. For the true peace of the Church doth more depend on the keeping of Gods lawes, then of obſerving mans inventions: eſpecially of ſuch things vvhich never brought peace vvith them to any Church, but as fire from hell haue alwaies bred a combuſtion. Neither yet can the Defendant juſtifie that vvhich he ſaith of civill governments, that they lawfully at any time more ſeverely puniſh that offence which is every way leſſe, then another vvhich is greater. Howſoever, he that hath but halfe an eye may ſee that it is but a ſophiſticall evaſion, common to our Prelates with the Papiſts. I will not therfore inſiſt in this; if you pleaſe, you may ſee more of this matter in M. *Parker* of the Croſſe, *part.* 2 *c.* 1 *ſ.* 16 17. He anſwereth in the ſecond place, *That it is not omiſſion, but contempt that is puniſhed*, *as if a Counſellour ſhould refuſe to weare a Lawyers gowne.* But 1 meere omiſſion hath been often puniſhed with ſuſpenſion. 2 The Convocation houſe by their Canons haue provided and appointed puniſhments for meere omiſſions. If thoſe canons be not in all ſuch points rigorouſly executed ; it is either ſome perſonall good vvhich is found in ſome Officers, or elſe meere ſhame. For though canons doe not bluſh, yet the executioners haue ſome forhead left. 3 There may be continued omiſſion, upon other cauſes beſide contempt, as ignorance, conſcience &c. ſo that vvhile the Def. ſo peremptorily chargeth others for ſlandering the Church of God, he manifeſtly ſlandereth them , which for any thing I know are as much the Church of God as the Prelates. Concerning this contempt ſee more in M. *Parker p.* 2 *c.* 1 *ſ.* 14. As for the Lawyers gowne, it is not long enough to cover the nakedneſſe of this anſwer ; no though it be ſtretched to the length of one of our great Prelates long traines vvhich are carryed up after them. For except the Counſellour would ſwear that he refuſed on conſcience, and that he could ſhew the judgement of the beſt Lawyers for his opinion, condemning ſuch a robe as unlawfull, the caſe is not like: and if the caſe be ſo put, I account that Lawyer worthy to be turned over the bar, that could not defend himſelfe from contempt.

SECT. XIIII.

IN the next place, the ſame thing is confirmed by the particular indignities; vvhich peaceable , learned, godly minded men doe ſuffer, for but declaring of their contrary judgement : as that they are accounted Puritanes, Schiſmaticks, and by canon excommunicated *ipſo facto* , ſo as no Councell ever cenſured any hereſie, vvithout liberty of appeal, vvhich is not denyed to great malefactors. *Conf. at Hampton. p.*26 *can.* 6 & 98. In the repeating of this Argument, I adde that out of the Abridgement , vvhich the Def. for I know not vvhat reaſon, omitted. Now in his anſwer he neither denyeth antecedent, nor conſequence, ſo that the judicious Reader may ſafely take all to be granted. Yet that he might ſeeme to ſay ſomevvhat , 1 he granteth that *wee haue reaſon perhaps to wiſh, that ſome penalties were releaſed.* And haue we not reaſon then to think the Convocation vvhich ſet theſe penalties was nothing leſſe then led by the ſpirit of God ? And if the Def. can thus ſhew his differing judgment from that Convocation in the penalties, what diſorder or exorbitancy is it for another to ſhevv his differing judgment from them and him in ceremonies.

Secondly, cloſly ſliding by the chiefeſt accuſation of *Puritaniſm*, vvhich yet is moſt ordinary, and moſt impure, he ſaith for *ſchiſme*, that thoſe vvhich vvill not conforme unto our ceremonies doe teach the principles of *Separation.* To vvhich I anſwer 1 That there vvas never yet any Prelate that confuted the opinion ~~of~~ Separatiſts any otherwiſe then by railing vvords: vvhereas on the ſide, diverſe moſt averſe from conformity haue ſoundly confuted them. 2 Our principles doe no more tend to Separation, then Saint *Iohns* rule doth, vvho vvhen *Diotrephes* played the Diœceſan in the Church, did vvrite unto the faithfull people that they ſhould not follow the evill vvhich vvas among them, but the good, 3 *Ioh.* 11.

Thirdly, he talketh of diverſe diſtractions in the Church, while ſome vvill heare onely a conformable Miniſter, and ſome onely an unconformable. But what is this to the purpoſe? For by this reaſon Conformers may as well be accuſed of ſchiſme as Not-conformers. Againe, if all did conforme, there would be ſtill the like diſtractions for ſome would onely heare preaching Miniſters, and ſome would never bee preſent but at reading. Some vvould onely heare godly Preachers: and ſome vvould onely taſt Lettice fit for their lippes. Who ſhould then be the authours of ſchiſme?

Fourthly, he telleth us that all Churches challenge a ſubſcription to their orders. But 1 all Churches cannot poſſibly doe this lawfully: becauſe ſome Churches doe directly contradict other in their decrees. 2 Few Churches require ſuch a forme of Subſcription as ours is, though they haue not the tenth part of doubts and difficulties in their formes, which we haue in ours. 3 I aske againe that vvhich M *Parker* hath asked vvithout an anſwer, that a Miniſter of the Goſpell ſhould be deprived for diſuſing Popiſh ceremonies, vvhen vvas it ever the judgement of any man vvhich vvas of note for learning, unleſſe he vvere intereſſed in the quarrell? *Calvin, Bucer, Beza, Martyr, Zanchie,* and many other haue given their judgement concerning thoſe controverſies: but ſhew either any of them, or among *Iewel, Fulke, Reynold, Whitakers, Perkins*, or any ſuch, that ever allowed of ſuch tyrannie. If there vvere any one among them of that opinion, vve ſhould haue heard of him. For our Defendant dares bring in the name heere of *Beza* himſelfe as making for him: Notwithſtanding *Beza* doth not onely condemne our Ceremonies in plaine termes, Epiſt. 8, but alſo in this very place vvhich is quoted out of Ep. 24 doth caſhier our ceremonies in the firſt vvords quoted by the Defendant himſelfe, *Conſtitutions being thus made* &c. What underſtandeth the Defendant by *thus*, or *hac ratione*? Surely thoſe conditions going before, which doe as abſolutely condemne our ceremonies as any argument in all the Abridgement.

SECT. XV.

AFter full ſatiſfaction given to our Arguments about the point of the worſhip (as the Def. vvould haue the Reader beleeue) he commeth to confute our Aſſumption. *viz.* the ceremonies are not eſteemed, impoſed, and obſerved as parts of Gods worſhip. But firſt I would know of him, vvhy he that talketh ſo much every where of *their own Witneſſes their own Witneſſes*, doth here firſt of all giue no anſwer to our Witneſſes, as hath been formerly ſhewed: and then paſſeth bv that vvhich is alledged in the Abridg. p.40 out of *his own Witneſſes*, D. *Covel*, and D. *Wilkes*? If they be not his Witneſſes, they are at leaſt the ceremonies Witneſſes: he ſhould therefore haue given ſome reſpect. But we ſhall haue another Champion come after this Def. as it is likely, vvho vvill as little regard him. For *juſtum eſt quod Spartæ prodeſt*, all is good that makes for the times.

Secondly, whereas he hath nothing to bring for confutation of our argument, but onely the judgement of the greater part of the impoſers, I ſay, this is no vvay ſufficient: For the queſtion here is not onely of *impoſing*, but alſo of *eſteeming* and *obſerving*.

Thirdly, I anſwer to the places alledged, that it cannot be Logically concluded either from any one, or from all of them, that they are not impoſed as parts of Gods vvorſhip. *We doe not attribute any holineſſe or ſpeciall worthineſs* (ſaith the canon) *unto the garments*. No more (ſay I) is any ſpeciall holineſſe or worthineſſe to be attributed unto water: yet in baptiſme it hath a holy relation to holineſſe. *The croſſe is not of the ſubſtance of the Sacrament.* What then? it may notwithſtanding be vvorſhip: except the Def. will acknowledge no vvorſhip but in the Sacrament. *Theſe ceremonies may be altered and changed:* by vvhom? By thoſe that appointed them. Shew me any Papiſt that dares affirme that the Church of Rome hath not authority to alter & change the ceremonies which her ſelfe hath appointed. But *the oppoſites doe acknowledge this. Abridg. p.53 55*, juſt as much as this Def. doth in this place acknowledge the ſame of the Church of Rome, vvhen he ſaith in this very page, that *Bellarmine with ſome other Papiſts ſeeme to diſclaime the neceſſity of ceremonies, and the placing of holineſſe in them.* So that in all this Section there is nothing to be found but vaine conceited confidence.

CHAP. III. SECT. I. II.

THE third Argument is, becauſe *all humane ceremonies, appropriated to God ſervice, if they be ordained to teach any ſpirituall duty by their myſticall ſignification, are unlawfull.* Concerning this, vve haue in the firſt Section a flouriſh of words.

In the ſecond Section, ſome thing is ſaid of *Math.* 7 8 10 11. But 1 vvhat vvas the reaſon that this Confuter of the Abridgement, ſhould paſſe by or put off the firſt and ſecond reaſon or confirmation there alledged, and ſnatch at one place of Scripture, vvhich is but a parcell of thoſe confirmations vvherewith the ſecond reaſon is backed? The firſt confirmation in the Abridgement is, that *the ſecond commandement forbids us to make to our ſelues the likeneſſe of any thing whatſoever for religious uſe: as it is underſtood by Bucer, Virel, Fulk, Andrewes and others.* The ſecond confirmation is, that *Chriſt is the onely Teacher of his Church, and appointer of all meanes whereby we ſhould be taught and admoniſhed of any holy duties.* For illuſtration of this ſecond reaſon, among twenty other allegations, ſomething is brought out of Math.7. Now the Def. paſſeth by the maine reaſons, and all other allegations that belongeth to them, and maketh a ſtand at this place of Mat.7, vvhich yet for ſubſtance hath once been handled before in the former Chapter. Is not this proper confuting?

Secondly, in this very text, he toucheth not that wherin onely the Abridgment groundeth their reaſon. For in the Abridgement, p.32 there is nothing cited out of Mark. 7, but the 4 and 7 verſes; he anſwereth to the 8 10 and 11 verſe. What ſhould a man ſay to ſuch dealing?

Thirdly, they ſay that *our Saviour by this Argument (among others) condemnes the Iewiſh purifyings and juſtifieth himſelfe and his diſciples in refuſing that ceremonie, becauſe being (the precept of men) it was taught and uſed as a doctrine by way of ſignification, to teach what inward purity ſhould be in them, and how they ought to be cleanſed from the pollutions of the Heathen For which interpretation of the place, they alledge Chryſoſtome, Whitakers, the Church of Wittenberg. Calvin, Virel, Zepperus, Fulk, Rainoldus and others.* To all this the Def. anſwereth nothing, but that with a ſimple denyall, he ſheweth that there were other cauſes vvhy our Saviour condemned thoſe vvaſhings: which is the very ſame thing vvhich the Abridgement affirmeth, vvhen they ſay, *by this Argument among others,* our Saviour condemned them. So that in all this

Section nothing at all is ſaid to the purpoſe: ſaue that in the winding up, the Defendant accuſeth thoſe of *Sadduceiſme* vvhich depart ſo farre from the *Phariſies*: Which accuſation, if it doth not touch our bleſſed Saviour himſelfe, I leaue to be conſidered by the Defendant himſelfe. Howſoever, the mentioning of *Phariſeiſme* in this matter is idle, for the Scripture ſaith expreſly that this ceremony vvas common to all the Iewes, *Mar.* 7 3.

SECT. III.

THE ſame kind of dealing vvhich vvas noted in the former Section, we meet vvith alſo in this. For, vvhereas in the third confirmation of this argument, the Abridgement bringeth in *Auguſtine*, the Churches of France and Flanders, *Calvin*, *Martyr*, *Beza*, *Sadeel*, *Danæus*, *Zepperus*, *Polanus*, *Iewel*, *Humfry*, &c. the Defendant calleth out *Auguſtine* alone by himſelfe, and that vvith a double trick. For firſt, he citeth but one place of *Auguſtine* vvhich vvas miſcited or miſprinted in the Abridgement, and leaveth out the other out of Epiſt. 5 rightly quoted in the Abridgement: Secondly, he maketh this place to conclude the maine argument, whereas in the Abridgement it illuſtrateth onely the third confirmation of that Argument. Concerning *Auguſtine* he anſwereth, 1 that in the firſt place cited there is no ſuch thing, vvhich I grant to be true, but if in ſtead of *lib.* 3. *cap.* 35 be ſet *lib.* 2 *cap.* 1 then ſomething vvill be found. 2 That elſewhere (not mentioning the fift Epiſt. which the Abridgement quoted) *Auguſtine* ſaith, that *all holy ſignes are called Sacraments*: but yet it doth not follow from hence that in his opinion all ſuch ſignes are Sacraments, but onely in vvord or phraſe of ſpeech. Neither vvas it brought in (as he might haue marked) to proue any ſuch thing, but onely to ſhew that ſuch ſignes participate part of the nature of Sacraments: and this as that uſe of the vvord Sacrament doth confirme, ſo that vvhich was derived from thence, and hath been in perpetuall uſe, *viz.* that ſuch ceremonies are called *Sacramentalia*, Sacramentals. But *neither Auguſtine, nor other fathers doe diſallow ſuch ceremonies* (ſaith the Defendant) and this we doe not deny: if by diſallowing be meant conſtant rejecting of ſuch things. Yet ſomething is to be found in their generall doctrine, from vvhich we may ſoundly conclude againſt theſe inventions of man.

SECT.

SECT. IIII.

BVt in this fourth Section, more legerdemaine is uſed then in many other. For when the Def. profeſſeth to anſwer the teſtimonies of Proteſtant Divines found in the Abridgement, he produceth onely foure, as if there were no more to be found: vvheras in the ſame place of the Abridgement, viz. p. 33. there be many more ioyned to theſe, as before I ſhewed by name: and to them divers others are added p. 35. But let us heare what he can ſay to theſe foure vvhich himſelfe hath choſen to anſwer. To *Calvin* he ſayth, that *he ſpeaketh onely of thoſe myſticall ceremonies which are properly ſacramentall.* And this, ſay I, was the very poynt for vvhich this place vvas alledged, viz. that ſuch ſignificant ſignes are properly ſacramentall. Is not this then good anſwering? Concerning *Myſticall-morall*, I vvill ſpeake ſomething in the next ſection. *Zepperus* ſayth hee) *hath not a word of myſticall ſignification.* The place is *lib.* 1. *cap.* 10. vvhere among divers rules, he giveth this for one, that ſacramentall ſignes muſt ſignifie holy things to be ſealed up in the heart: from vvhence hee concludeth as againſt *Humane traditions, becauſe God will not by them ſtirre up any grace in the heart of man*: ſo in ſpeciall by this vvith ſome other rules, hee concludeth againſt the ſigne of the Croſſe, and other ſuch ceremonies in Baptiſme. Is this nothing? *Iewel inſiſteth onely in ſacramentall ſignes*; and ſuch ſayth the Abridgement, are all that ſignifie ſpirituall graces. As for *Beza*, hee granteth him in a manner to condemne all ſymbolicall ſignes. But to extenuate his credit herein, hee would haue the reader beleeve, that no other Divine doth conſent with him herein. But if any man look upon the places quoted in the Abridgement, p 35. viz. *Harm Confeſſ. part.* 2 *p.* 229. 230. *Eiuſd. Sect.* 17. *ad Saxon. Confeſſ. obſ.* 1. *Calv. in Eſ* 20. *& in Math.* 21. 25. *Perkins in Gal.* 3. *p.* 231. he ſhall find that *Beza* is not alone in this poynt. Beſide, *Bellarmine* confeſſeth that *Brentius* is of this minde, *De cult. ſanct. lib.* 3 *cap.* 7. and in his 2 book *De effect ſacr.* he ioyneth herein vvith *Brentius*, *Calvin* and *Chemnitius*. I vvill add one vvhom this Def. calleth worthily *a judicious refuter of Bellarmine*: i. *Iunius.* His words (in his animadverſions upon *Bell. de cultu ſanct. lib.* 3. *c.* 7. *an.* 12) are theſe; *Quod ſi ad uſum non poteſt quiſquam inſtituere, profecto neque ad ſignificationem homo legitime poteſt adhibere, &c.* i. *Humane ceremonies cannot be lawfully uſed for ſignification without incroching, no not in private, much leſſ in the Church of God & publick adminiſtration. There can bee no bleſſing or conſecration Eccleſiaſticall, without the word and prayer. Here is no word of inſtitution: and prayer of faith there* *can be none, where there is no commandement nor promiſe of God inſtituting.*

To Iunius add Danæus, cont. Bell. de Cult. ſanct. l. 3. c. 7. *It is blaſphemy to thinke, that any outward thing may be made a ſigne in the Church, unleſſe it be expreſly ordained in the word, and commanded by God himſelfe to be uſed unto that end.*

SECT. V.

HEre that vvhich in the Abridgement is the third proofe of a propoſition, and backed with many allegations, is nakedly brought in that it may be the better maiſtered. *Symbolycall ſignification giveth unto ceremonies a chiefe part of ſacraments.* For the clearing of this poynt, the Defendant *diſtinguiſheth betwixt morall ſignes and ſacramentall. Of ſacramentall he maketh two parts, one after the manner of a ſigne, and the other of a ſeale: then he maketh a difference betwixt morall and ſacramental ſignes, not onely that ſacraments doe ſeale, which morall ſignes do not, but alſo that ſacramentall ſignes doe repreſent a collation of grace given by God unto man; whereas morall doe onely notifie a dutie of man which in ſome moral vertue he oweth unto God.* Then after he findeth fault with this, that ſignification ſhould bee called *the chiefe poynt of a ſacrament.* Now for the firſt, I doe not marvell that he calleth his diſtinctions wedges: for this is a moſt unhappy wedge indeed, which riveth in ſunder the holy ſacraments of God, and maketh way for humane inventions to creep into their place. The ſacraments (ſayth he) doe ſignifie grace conferred: and morall ſignes doe ſignifie a dutie of man in ſome morall vertue. But the Scripture teacheth us that the Sacraments doe alſo ſignifie the dutie of man towards God. For by the ſacraments the whole covenant is ſigned and ſealed betwixt God and man: ſo that not onely Gods conferring of grace, but mans dutie through grace is there profeſſed and repreſented. This the name *Sacrament*, as it ſignifieth an oath or obligation, doth import, by *Bellarmines* owne confeſſion: *de ſacram. l.* 1. *c.* 8. This the name *Euchariſt* doth alſo ſhew, in the Lords Supper, notifying that thankfulneſſe we owe unto God. This the words of inſtitution doe plainly teſtifie in the Lords Supper, *Doe this in remembrance of me.* And I think the Def. vvhen he conſidereth the matter well, will not dare to deny, but that *ſanctitie* (which he ſayth is ſignified by the Surplice) is ſignified in Baptiſme: and *conſtancie* alſo which hee aſcribeth to the croſſe. If he doe, he may be eaſily confuted, by thoſe places where the ſcripture ſpeaketh of it, eſpecially Rom. 6. throughout the chapter.

Bono nodo malus cuneus.

2 Againſt that morall ſignification attributed unto humane in-

ventions, I propound this argument, in the words of a reverend man (whom for ſome reaſon I will not name.) *To be a teacher of my underſtanding, and an exciter of my devotion, are ſuch effects as require vertue inherent or aſſiſtent to thoſe things which ſhould be cauſes of them: but no ſigne of mans deviſing hath any ſuch vertue in it, or with it: for then it muſt come from that word put forth in the creation, and ſo things naturall ſhould haue a force communicated to them of teaching ſupernaturall: or elſe by Gods after-inſtitution: ſuch we read not any but of Baptiſme and the Lords ſupper onely: or by the Churches impetration. But this cannot be: for prayer obtaineth thoſe effects of things, to which they ſerue by Gods creation and inſtitution: but not any creating or new conception of things to ſupernaturall uſes. For then the Church might ask that this or that creature might be made a ſacrament unto her: in which caſe ſhe ſhould pray without all warrant from Gods will.*

3 If humane inventions be ſuch morall admoniſhers in ſpirituall duties, the conſciences of men without doubt are bound to ſubject themſelves unto their admonitions: and then unto them from whom they doe admoniſh, or by whom they are made admoniſhers: i. to mortal men, ſuch as our convocation conſiſts on. Is not this good divinitie?

4 Whatſoever is ordained in the Church as a teaching ſigne, that ought often to bee interpreted unto the people in Sermons: for that is the teaching which muſt cleare and perfect all teaching of ſignes: and ſhould not they preach fairly in the name and words of Chriſt, that ſhould expound unto the people the ſignification of a ſurplice and a croſſe? Would not this alſo be much for the edification of the people, that ſometime they muſt heare of the morall good vvhich the ceremonies teach: and ſometime be admoniſhed of the right meaning of our convocation houſe in the appointing of theſe ceremonies, leſt they turne them to morall evill in ſuperſtition: and at other times they muſt be inſtructed, how to defend theſe ceremonies againſt the oppoſers of them, leſt otherwiſe they uſe them without faith? Surely all the Sermons which many Pariſhes heare, would ſcarce be ſufficient for this doctrine of Ceremonies.

5 I dare appeale to the conſciences of the beſt conforming Chriſtians, whether ever they found themſelves truely ſtirred up to *holineſſe*, by the Surplice, or to *conſtancie* by the Croſſe? one thing I am ſure of, that in ſome one congregation where theſe ceremonies haue not appeared for 20 or 30 yeares together, there hath been more holineſſe and conſtancie of faith, then in many Cathedrall Churches where they were never omitted.

This poynt being cleared, there need no great anſwer be given to the cavill, of making *ſignification the chiefe poynt of a ſacrament.*

For if the Def. meant to deale plainly,vvhy doth he change the vvords,that he may find ſome colour for his accuſation? The Abridgement ſayth onely that it is *a chiefe part*: he accuſeth them for ſaying it is *the chiefe part*: betwixt vvhich two phraſes,he knoweth how great roome there is for a wedge. 2. To proue that ſignification is one chiefe part,the Abridgement alleageth *Gen.*17.11. *Exod.*12.13.*Luk.*22.19. why is no anſwer given to theſe places, if the aſſertion bee falſe? 3 The Def. himſelfe in his diſtinction which he bringeth here concerning a ſacrament, doth allow one chiefe part of a ſacraments nature to be *ſignification ad modum ſigni. Bellarmine* therefore hath as good a friend of him as of the Abridgement.

But (ſayth he,arguing herein againſt himſelfe) *if ſignification bee a principall part of a ſacrament, then all the morall ſignes uſed in the Leviticall worſhip, ſhould be properly deemed ſacraments.* Why ſo? *becauſe things take their denomination from the principall parts.* True: but 1. as hath been obſerved, there is difference betwixt *a principall* and *the principall.* 2. Every thing that hath denomination from a principall part,hath not properly the ſame name vvith it. A man may in ſome ſenſe be called ſpirituall, becauſe his principall part is a ſpirit: yet he may not be properly deemed a ſpirit. 3. all thoſe ceremonies which had ſignification in the Leviticall law, haue this denomination from ſacraments, that they are properly called *Sacramentall*: i. participating ſomething of the nature of ſacraments, though they be not ſacraments properly ſo called.

SECT. VI.

A Second objection from reaſon is here brought in. viz. that *if ceremonies which God himſelfe hath ordained to teach his Church by their morall ſignification, may not now be uſed: much leſſe may any of thoſe which man hath deviſed.* But vvhy doth the Def. paſſe by all the allegations vvhich belong to this reaſon in the Abridgement, p. 33. 34. they cite to this purpoſe firſt the Councel of Nice, *Auſtine, Martyr, Bullinger, Lavater, Hoſpinian, Piſcator, Cooper, Weſtphalus,*&c. And then after, *Calvin, Bullinger, Hoſpinian, Arcularius, Virel, Bilſon, Reynolds, Willet, &c.* And againe, *Calvin, Bullinger, Chemnitius, Danæus, Hoſpinian, Arcularius,* our book of Homilies, *Humphrey, Reynolds, Willet, &c.* Are all theſe worth no anſwer? at leaſt they ſhew, that this is no new reaſon diviſed by the Nonconformiſts: but the common tenent of Proteſtants, and the ground whereby they confute the ſuperſtition of Papiſts.

Yet let us heare his anſwer to the reaſon as it is nakedly in it ſelfe conſidered: remembring alwayes,that he can ſay nothing,but that which the Papiſts may as well ſay for many of their ceremonies againſt this argument preſſed vpon them by our Divines.

His firſt anſwer is, that *the uſe of ſome Iewiſh rite, without any Iewiſh opinion, is not damnable: inſtancing in circumciſion and Eaſter.* Where 1. he ſhould haue told us, how a Iewiſh rite can bee uſed, without ſome part of a Iewiſh opinion? For he himſelfe after contendeth, that our ceremonies are not the ſame with the Papiſts, becauſe wee haue not the ſame opinion of them which the Papiſts haue. 2. What doth he mean by this new tearme *damnable*? I hope he doth not ſymbolize with the Papiſts in their difference of *mortall* ſinne and *veniall*? of which fault he ſo vainly accuſed us before. If he meane by *not damnable*, not *unlawfull*: then hee holdeth circumciſion, as it is uſed vnder *Preſter Iohn*, to be lawfull. If hee meaneth any thing elſe, as, that it doth not utterly deſtroy the being of a Church, then he ſpeaketh ſome truth, but nothing at all to the purpoſe.

His ſecond anſwer is, that *it is farre more ſafe to invent new ceremonies, then to uſe thoſe which God once appoynted, and now hath aboliſhed: becauſe they might ingender an opinion of neceſſitie: and ſo might bring in all the Leviticall law.* Where 1. it is well he confeſſeth plainly, that all the Iewiſh ceremonies are aboliſhed: for therein hee contradicteth that which hee ſayd in his former anſwer. 2. from hence our divines uſe thus to argue, *Num vero veteres figuræ ſublatæ ſunt, ut locus eſſet novis? num divinæ ſublatæ ſunt, ut humanæ ſuccederent:* i. *Are divine ceremonies aboliſhed, that humane may bee erected in their place?* They are the words of Doctor *Whitaker, de Pontif. cont.* 4. *q.* 7. *c.* 3. and the reaſon is ſtrong. For if it had been the will of God that we ſhould haue bee been taught by other ſignes then thoſe that are appoynted in the New Teſtament, hee could eaſily, and vvould ſurely either haue choſen ſome of the old, or appoynted ſome new in their places. 3. Though there may bee more danger in ſome reſpect, on the one ſide, yet there may bee more abſolutely on the other. 4. The inventing of new humane ceremonies haue ingendred an opinion of *neceſſitie* in them: and haue brought in all the *Popiſh law* of rites: ſo that even in theſe reſpects, it may be queſtioned in whether ſide is greater danger.

SECT. VII.

THe third and laſt reaſon vvhich the Def. could find brought againſt ſignificant ceremonies, is, that *this will open a gappe to* *images, oyle, ſpittle, and all Popiſh ceremonies: all which Bellarmine commendeth, as fit to put men in remembrance of good things, &c.* To this hee anſwereth divers things. 1. *This conſequence* (ſayth hee) *from ſome to all, is too laviſh.* But this conſequence is of his owne framing: for the conſequent vvhich the Abridgement maketh, is from the common nature of ſignificant ceremonies, to every ſpeciall, being equally conſidered in regard of other circumſtances. Neither is there any occaſion at all in the Abridgement for that ridiculous conſequence which the Def. maketh from *may* to *muſt*, in his example of the Kings Councell.

Secondly, *It is as unreaſonable* (ſayth hee) *as if a Patient that hath ſome drugges preſcribed him, ſhould thence conclude hee may taſte of all.* But it is as reaſonable, ſay I, as if a Patient having ſome druggs preſcribed unto him, ſhould thence conclude, he may taſte of any which are of the ſame nature, eſpecially if the ſame Phyſitian ſhould preſcribe them unto him.

Thirdly, *It is unconſcionable* (ſayth hee) *becauſe there are many abuſes mixed with Popiſh ceremonies.* Which anſwer ſeemeth meerly unconſcionable; becauſe it is plainly expreſſed in the Abridgement, that this inference doth conſider the Popiſh ceremonies onely, in regard of that ſignification vvhich they haue of good things.

Fourthly, he diſproveth the uſe of oyle and ſpittle, *becauſe they were once vſed miraculouſly.* As if the miraculous uſing of any thing did forbid, that it ſhould at any time after bee uſed for ſignification. Surely then the many miracles vvhich hiſtories do record to haue been done by the Croſſe, muſt needs baniſh that alſo out of the Church.

Fiftly, for Images, hee ſayth, *They are not to be called Popiſh, but onely in regard of ſuperſtitious adoration.* As if *Caſſanders* image were not Popiſh: which is an aſſertion, 1. directly againſt all our Divines, vvho not onely confute the Papiſts for adoration of their images, but alſo for having them in any religious uſe, eſpecially in Churches; for this is the controverſie betwixt *Calvin* and *Bellarmine, de Imag. lib.* 2. *c.* 9. wherein this Defendant taketh *Bellarmines* part. Secondly, it is directly againſt the Homily concerning images: unto which we are bound to ſubſcribe. Thirdly, it confirmeth the foule words of *Bellarmine*, who ſaith that the Apologie of the Church of England lieth, in ſaying that the Councel of *Frankford* decreed that Images ſhould be aboliſhed, *De Concil. Auth. lib.* 2. *c.* 8. for the onely anſwer is that which *Iunius* giveth in his notes upon that chapter, *an.* 56. *He that forbiddeth Images to be worſhipped doth forbid the having of Images worſhipable, eſpecially in Churches:* Which anſwer this Defendant doth flatly deny.

Sixtly, for holy water, he ſayth, *that may bee accounted Chriſtian, were it not for the operatiue power which is aſcribed unto it in Poperie.* But good Proteſtants, I thinke, will rather beleeve *Calvin*, who calleth it *a kind of repetition of baptiſme. Inſtit.l.4.c.*10. *ſect.*20. and *Iunius*, who peremptorily affirmeth, that *no humane ordination, opinion, or ſuperſtition, can make it good and profitable. in Bel. de Cul. ſanct. l.*3.*c.*7. At the leaſt let it be called *Iewiſh*, not *Chriſtian*: for Chriſt will not haue his name called upon ſuch ſuperſtitious devices: neither can it, without taking in vaine.

7 *Laſtly*, he ſayth, *there is no reaſon to deprive the Church of power of ordeining ſignificant ceremonies, becauſe ſhe may abuſe it*: wherein he ſaith true. But to argue from manifeſt abuſes, againſt that which is called uſe, and yet is as like thoſe abuſes as one egge is like another, this I hope is reaſon.

That which by the way is brought out of *Peter Martyr*, is not of any great force. For he there perſuadeth that unto *Hooper* out of a good affection, which out of conſcience he durſt not doe himſelfe, though his place at Oxford did tie him unto it, as hee profeſſeth in an Epiſtle, p. 1127. Where alſo hee ſheweth, that the chiefe end that moved him ſo to perſuade *Hooper*, was becauſe he hoped, that by his and ſuch mens yeelding, the ceremonies might in time be aboliſhed: which we find to be an erronious conjecture. But that hath much leſſe reaſon in it which he addeth, viz. *that the open gap of many ceremonies is now quite ſhut up, becauſe our church is contented to admit of ſo few, and no more.* For 1. we haue not ſo much as the word of our Prelats for this *nil-ultra.* 2. The gap is every day made wider and wider by ſuch defenſes as this is, which allow of Images themſelues for ſome religious uſe. For by this meanes any crucifix may come in, that is not greater then the Church doore. 3 They that ſhut up a gap upon their pleaſure onely, can when they pleaſe open it againe.

Now I haue maintained the teſtimonies and reaſons which this Def. could find in the Abridg. againſt ſignificant ceremonies, I wil add one, leſt it ſhould be forgotten, or loſt: which I know not how the Def. leaped over, ſeeing in the Abridg. it hath deſervedly the firſt place among all the proofes, which are brought in to this purpoſe. The argument ſtands thus in the Abridg. p. 31. *The ſecond commandement forbids us to make to our ſelves the likeneſſe of any thing whatſoever, for religious uſe: and ſo is this commandement underſtood by Bucer, Virel, Fulk, and D. Andrewes now Biſhop of Wincheſter.* And p. 32. 33. D. *Andrewes* is brought in alledging this for the root of all ſuperſtition and idolatry, *that men thought they could never haue admonitions and helps enough to ſtirre them up to worſhip God. Yet God* (ſayth he) *had given foure meanes, viz. the word written, the word* *preached, the ſacraments, and the book of the creatures.*

Now leſt the Def. may ſeeme to have paſſed over this proofe as unworthy any anſwer, I will briefly add the grounds of it.

1. The word תמונה *likeneſſe* uſed in the ſecond commandement is generall, and comprehendeth under it all religious ſimilitudes, becauſe they are homogeneal to Images there expreſly forbidden.

2. Significant ceremonies are external acts of religious worſhip, even as they are uſed to further devotion. *Suarez. in Thom. p. 3. q. 65. a. 4. Bell. de effect. ſacr. l. 2. c. 29. & c. 31.* and therefore being invented of man, of the ſame nature of Images, by vvhich and at which God is vvorſhipped. The Def. diſtinction of *eſſentiall* & *accidentall* worſhip, vvill help no more here, then the Papiſts δουλεία and λατρεία. Gods law is not mocked with vain diſtinctions.

3. The affirmatiue part inioyneth obedience to all the worſhip appoynted by God: all which was ſignificative, *Heb.* 8. 5. & 10. 1. from whence it followeth, that no ſignificant ceremonies muſt by man be brought into religious actions. The nature of the affirmatiue ſheweth the qualitie of the negative: by the circuit of the one, we may learn the compaſſe of the other.

4 Significant ceremonies which are by inſtitution, muſt of neceſſitie belong vnto the ſecond commandement. An accurate diſtinction of the commandement will eaſily ſhew this. But nothing contained in the ſecond commandement is permitted to man. For to him this comandement in regard of *making*, is wholly negatiue. *Thou ſhalt not make to thy ſelf, &c.* Which words, as *Calvin* ſayth, *Nos à carnalibus obſervatiunculis, quas ſtolida mens noſtra comminiſci ſolet, in totum revocant & abſtrahunt.*

SECT. VIII.

IN this paſſage there is nothing to bee found but a noyſe of vvords crackling like thornes under a pot: Let it therefore vaniſh of it ſelfe.

SECT. IX.

HEre the Defendant undertaketh and beginneth a confutation from Scriptures of that aſſertion, vvhich denieth ſignificant ceremonies of mans inſtitution to bee lawfull in Gods worſhip. Now a man would haue exſpected by the title, ſome rule of Scripture: but ſeeing none can bee found, vvee muſt bee content vvith examples: vvhich notwithſtanding are nothing ſo firme and certaine as rules. Yet let us heare what examples he can bring.

The firſt example is *Abrahams* directing of his ſervant to put his hand under his thigh vvhen he did ſwear. It is mervaile he did not beginne before *Abraham*. For *Suarez* the Ieſuit to proue the ſame point for ſubſtance, bringeth *Abels* ſacrifice, *Noahs* Altar &c. in *Thom.* 3. *qu.* 65 *a* 4, which ſerue alſo as much to the purpoſe as this example. But to the point in hand. 1 It is in all probabilty falſe, that *Abraham* appointed this ceremony. So *Calvin*, *Iunius* and others upon the ſame place, doe judge, becauſe it vvas a ſigne of ſubjection uſuall in thoſe eaſterne parts.

2 It is falſe alſo (vvhich he ſaith in the ſecond place) that ſwearing is the moſt divine ſeruice of God of all other. For the proper end of ſwearing is not to vvorſhip God, but to confirme a truth: though in the appealing unto a ſupreme Witneſſe and Iudge worſhip is implyed, and ſo an oath appropriated unto God as a part of his vvorſhip, not in the principall end of it, but in manner of ſeeking that end. This is plaine by the nature of an oath.

3 It cannot be proved, that this ceremony did teach any ſpirituall dutie. It is moſt probable, that it was a common ſigne of ſubjection uſed in ſolemnities of that kinde, as well out of an oath as in it, vvithout any reſpect unto Chriſt, as vvith it. If the Def. never read any ſuch thing (as he ſaith he did not) I cannot helpe that. I aſſent unto *Calvin* herein the rather, becauſe that as impoſition of hands in thoſe parts did alwaies ſignifie ſome ſuperiority, ſo this under poſition of hands vvas by proportion fit to ſignifie ſubjection of inferiours.

4 Laſtly, if all this vvere granted, that this ſigne vvas appointed, that it vvas appointed in ſolemne vvorſhip, and that it did ſignifie a holy thing: yet the Defendant ſhould remember that *Abraham* vvas a Prophet, and of more authority by farre in the Church of God, then our Convocation-houſe. So that this inſtance is nothing to the purpoſe, as, I am perſwaded, *Abrahams* ſervant vvould ſweare, if he vvere heere preſent, and it vvere needfull, even in the ſame manner that then hee did to his Maſter.

SECT. X.

Heere comes in a ſtragling objection, as it is here alledged vvithout any dependance, omitted in the place whereto it belongeth. I vvill not therefore preſſe it in this place. Onely it vvould be marked how little the Defendant careth what he ſaith, ſo that he ſay ſomething to every thing: 1 he anſwereth that

Papiſts doe commonly teach by their ceremonies ſome new doctrine, not warranted by Scriptures. For confutation of which, the Papiſts may well appeale to *Durandus* his *Rationale*, vvhere he ſheweth the ſignification of almoſt all the Popiſh rites. Now if the Defendant can there finde one ſignification of a hundred, vvhich teacheth any ſtrange doctrine not warranted by the Scriptures, I haue taken my numbers amiſſe. 2 He ſaith *the Papiſts ceremonies differ from ours in application, by their opinion of neceſſity and holineſſe* But 1 the queſtion heere is onely of ſignification: and therfore it is out of time to talke of application: 2 the Papiſts doe not hold their ceremonies abſolutely neceſſarie to ſalvation. For this *Bellarmine de verbo non ſcripto l 4 c.* 11 denyeth of all unwritten traditions, as alſo *Aquinas* 1 2. *qu*. 147 *a* 4 *ad* 1. Neither doe they hold them eſſentially neceſſary to the being of a Sacrament: This *Aquinas* with all his followers deny, *p* 4 *qu*. 66 *a* 10. vvhere he ſaith expreſly, that *all ſignes invented by man are onely for ſtirring up of devotion, and procuring of reverence to the Sacraments*: vvhich is, word for word, our Engliſh plea. 3 It doth not appeare that the learned Papiſts haue any opinion of all their ſignificant ceremonies, vvhich this Def. doth not maintaine. For *Suarez* a principall Ieſuit in *Thom. p.* 3 *q.* 65 *a* 4 propoundeth onely three errours as he calleth them, vvherin Proteſtants differ from Papiſts concerning ceremonies in generall: wherof the firſt is, that *onely thoſe things which are written ought to be retained and uſed in the Church*: The ſecond is, that *no outward worſhip of God is lawfull, but onely that which is appointed by God*. The third and laſt is, that *the Church hath not power of commanding and ordeyning thoſe things* (hee meaneth myſticall ceremonies) *which are neceſſarie for the convenient celebration of the Sacraments*. Now there is none of theſe three points vvherin *Suarez* and the Def. doth not jumpe.

SECT. XI.

THE next example is the day vvhich *Mordecai* and *Eſter* appointed, *Eſt*. 9 concerning vvhich I anſwer 1 it was no myſticall ceremonie: but a circumſtance of order. When *Bellarmine* objecteth the ſame example to like purpoſe againſt the Proteſtants, *de cult. ſanct. lib.* 3. *c.* 10. *Iunius* anſwereth, *præceptum fuit politicum: it was a precept of order*. And ſome of our owne Writers at home that it was appointed for a civill uſe, a day of rejoycing.

SECT.

SECT. XII.

THE Feaſt of Dedication, ordained by *Iudas Maccabeus* is alſo alledged by *Bellarmine de cult. ſanct. li.3 c.5. & de Rom. pont li.4 c.17* but we need not be ſo carefull of excuſing *Machabeus* and thoſe times from all fault. Chriſt ſeemeth, ſaith hee, to approue that feaſt, *Ioh.*10 22, but *ſeemeth* onely, ſay I. It is ſaid that Chriſt vvho had been before that time reſident in Ieruſalem, vvas walking in *Salomons* porch at the Feaſt of Dedication, when ſome Iewes came to aske him vvhether he was the Chriſt or no; doth it follow that he obſerved the Feaſt? As for *Danæus* heere cited, it hath been ſhewed before how well he liked of ſignificant ceremonies ordained by man.

SECT. XIII. XIIII.

HEere M. *Cartwright* is brought in as anſwering the former objections out of the Machabees and *Eſter*. But M. *Cartwright* p. 197, doth profeſſe that there is as great difference betwixt theſe two, as is betwixt heaven and earth. And in his Confutation of the Rhemiſts, vvho urge the feaſt of Dedication as this Def. doth in *Ioh.*10 22, he anſwereth plainely, that this Feaſt was unduely inſtituted and ungroundedly by the Machabees. Which alſo he proveth by ſuch reaſons as neither the Rhemiſts, nor this Def. vvill ever anſwer. Yet let us heare, vvhat he hath choſen out of M. *Cartwright* to anſwer. *The Church may appoint holy daies in certaine caſes: but it is one thing to reſtraine part of the day, and another to reſtraine the whole day.* Where 1 M. *Cartwright* is vvronged by the Def. for he confeſſeth (in the places quoted) expreſly, that upon ſome extraordinary caſes the Church may reſtraine a whole day, as at a ſolemne faſt. 2 He ſhould let us ſee vvhat myſticall ſignification is in the times appointed, as he ſtriveth to doe in other ſignificant ceremonies: if he vvould haue a more particular anſwer, otherwiſe they are alledged heere to no purpoſe to proue ſignificant ceremonies.

The other vvords quoted out of M. *Cartwright* are, that *the example out of Eſter is no ſufficient warrant for our Holy daies: 1 becauſe our eſtate ought not to be ſo ceremonious as theirs. 2 That was done by a ſpeciall direction of the ſpirit of God.* To this the Def. anſwereth firſt, *that if then when the ceremonies were ſo many one might be added, much more now.* Which conſequence vvere good, *cæteris paribus*, if all other things did agree: but this is that very thing vvhich M. *Cartwright* denyed. He anſwereth in the ſecond place, that *it is* *preſumption to imagine a ſpeciall direction where none can be proved.* But how ſhall vve truſt this man in relating the Arguments and Anſwers of the Miniſters in private conference, vvhen now the ſecond time, as it vvere in one breath, he ſo unjuſtly accuſeth M. *Cartwright* as giving no reaſon for that he ſaith, vvhoſe printed booke doth confute him? for ſo it followeth in M. *Cartwright*, immediately upon the vvords by him quoted, p. 194. *This may appeare by another place, where the Iewes changed their faſts into feaſts, onely by the mouth of the Lord, through the miniſterie of the Prophet. For further proofe whereof I take the* 28 *ver. where it appeareth that this was an order to endure alwayes, even as long as other feaſt daies, which were inſtituted by the Lord himſelfe: ſo that what abuſes ſoever were of that feaſt, yet as a perpetuall decree of God it ought to haue remained: whereas our Churches can make no ſuch decree, which may not upon change of time and other circumſtances be altered. For the other proofe hereof I take the laſt verſe. For the Prophet contenteth not himſelfe with that, that he had rehearſed the decree, as he doth ſometime the decree of profane Kings, but addeth preciſely, that as ſoone as ever the decree was made, it was regiſtred in this booke of* Eſter, *which is one of the bookes of Canonicall Scripture: declaring therby in what eſteem they had it. If it had been of no further authority then our decrees, or then a canon of one of the Councels, it had been preſumption to haue brought it into the Library of the Holy Ghoſt.*

SECT. XV. XVI.

IN the title of theſe two Sections, the Defendant promiſeth an inſtance of a ceremonious inſtrument belonging unto the vvorſhip of God. But he bringeth none ſaue the Altar of the two tribes mentioned, *Ioſh.* 22 vvhich hee cannot ſhew to haue been any inſtrument of Gods worſhip: ſo that he ſeemeth meerely to haue forgotten his title. But for the thing it ſelfe M. *Parker* long ſince *p.*1 *c.*2 *ſ.*33 hath given this anſwer. 1 that we may better argue from the Altar of *Damaſcus* 2 *King.*16 againſt the croſſe, then they can from this Altar for it. 2 that this Altar of the two Tribes, vvas not in ſtate or uſe religious as the Croſſe is, vvhich he confirmeth by the confeſſion of B. *Babington* on the ſecond Com. and by the teſtimony of *Lavater* on *Ioſ. hom.*61, 3 that in this our men ſay nothing vvhich the Papiſts alledge not for their ſuperſtitions, and the Lutherans for their images, as probably as they, *Maſius* and *Chitreus* upon this place. To the ſame purpoſe tendeth the anſwer vvhich the Def. hath ſet downe in the name of certaine Miniſters. Let us here therefore his Reply. 1 He proveth the ſetting up of this Altar to haue beene humane, which no man that I know ever doubted of.

2 He would proue that it vvas appointed to Gods ſeruice. But alas he can bring no colour for that. *It was a patterne* (ſaith hee) *of the Lords altar, which was a chiefe inſtrument of Gods worſhip : as our croſſe is a reſemblance of the croſſe of Chriſt.* Where 1 vvhy doth he compare the croſſe vvheron Chriſt did ſuffer vvith the Lords Altar? that croſſe vvas no more holy, then the ſouldiers that nailed Chriſt to it, or then *Iudas*, that betrayed him into their hands: and therefore the ſigne of that croſſe in reſpect of the reſemblance vvhich it hath to that, is no more holy then the picture of *Iudas.* 2 Is every reſemblance of a holy thing holy? then every Ale-houſe picture, vvhich reſembleth any thing belonging to the Scripture & holy uſes, is alſo holy. 3 If any of the Tyrians which vvrought under *Salomon* about the vvork of the Temple, ſhould haue procured a modell of the Temple to be drawne, and carried it vvith him into his Country for to haue ſhewed it them for newes, had that model been religious or holy? the Def. thought he had to doe with ſuch as vvould beleeue whatſoever he ſaid.

3 He goeth about to proue, that it vvas myſticall ſignification teaching a ſpirituall dutie: becauſe that one end of it vvas, *in reſpect of the preſent Gileadites, to teach that the Lord was God:* and another *in reſpect of their poſterity, to teſtifie their conſent in the true Religion.* But in all this faire ſhew, there is ſcarce one word true. For 1 it doth not appeare out of the text, that there vvas intended any uſe of it for the preſent age that then lived. The contrary appeareth plainly, verſ. 27, 28 &c. The laſt verſe cited to this purpoſe by the Defendant, muſt be interpreted as *Iunius* noteth out of the 30 verſe. So that even by this it is manifeſt that a direct helpe unto devotion vvas not ſought for in the erecting of this altar. For then not onely the two Tribes then living ſhould haue had uſe of it, but moſt of the other Tribes ſhould haue had reaſon to haue imitated their example, in ſetting up Altars of devotion even at every three-way-leet, as croſſes are wont to ſtand. 2 in regard of poſterity, the immediate end was to teſtifie, that though they were ſeparated from the other Tribes by the river Iordan, yet they belonged to the ſame people, and had right to come unto the ſame place of vvorſhip. Now vvhat is this to a ceremonie which hath ſtate and immediate uſe in the ſpeciall ſolemne worſhip of God? the uſe of this teſtifying vvas to procure a conſent and approbation in future times among the other Tribes, that theſe two Tribes might be ſuffered to come to the Temple for to worſhip God there. So that neither the two Tribes, nor the other ten were ſtirred up by this Altar as by an inſtituted myſtical ceremonie unto vvorſhip or devotion: for as for the two Tribes, they vvere

onely to ſhew this monument unto thoſe vvhich called their right into queſtion. And the other were to conſent and grant them their right. What is this to a garment of religion, or ſolemne religious vvorſhip?

SECT. XVII. XVIII. XIX. XX. XXI.

THE ſecond inſtance is *Salomons* altar, 1 King. 8 64, wherein I cannot but marvell at the addition vvhich the Def. maketh unto the Text, vvhen he telleth us out of the Scripture of an *altar*, and of a *brazen Altar*, built by *Salomon*, vvithout ſpeciall warrant: whereas in the text there is neither mention made of braſſe, nor of Altar, but onely of ſanctifying the inner part of the Court: he did not ſurely attend much unto that vvhich hee wiſheth to another, ſect. 20 in theſe vvords, *I would you had leaſure to looke more directly upon the text alledged.* But for the matter it ſelfe, it is vvorth the marking, to obſerue by this example vvhat authority is given unto men in the vvorſhip of God by our Maſters of ceremonies, not onely to appoint accidentall vvorſhip, but even that vvhich is principall and moſt eſſentiall: that which maketh other eſſentiall vvorſhip to be holy: For what is this elſe, vvhen they ſay man may of his own head appoint an Altar? If they ſay man may appoint an Altar, but not the offering upon the Altar, let them heare our Saviours anſwer, Math. 23 19 *Yee fooles and blind, whether is greater, the offering, or the Altar that ſanctifieth the offering?*

As for our anſwer it is the ſame vvhich all our divines giue unto *Bellarmine*: as the objection is the very ſame vvith that which *Bellarmine* oppoſeth to *Calvin, de pont. lib. 4 c. 19.* 1. *this act of Salomons was by ſpeciall direction of Gods Spirit.* So D. *Whitakers* anſwereth, *de pont. c. 4 qu. 7 ad arg. 7 quicquid Salomon fecit, id Dei authoritate & ſpiritus ſancti nutu fecit.* So D. *Sutcleiſe de pont. l. 4 c. 6.* But from M. *Nic.* this anſwer vvill not be received. The Def. ſaith it can never be proved. But ſuppoſe an altar to haue been built as the Def. vvill haue it, and then I hope the nature of the thing doth ſufficiently proue it, as before I ſhewed: Beſide *Salomon* had not yet declined from the right vvaies of his father *David*, vvho did attempt nothing about the Temple but according to the vvriting which he received from God, as he told *Salomon* 1 Chron. 28 19. Neither is it to be omitted, that *Salomon* at that very time vvhen he did this thing in queſtion, was acted and lifted up extraordinarily in communion vvith God: as appeareth by that divine prayer vvhich he then made for the Dedication of the Temple, vvhich cannot be judged but to proceed from the extraordinary direction of Gods holy Spirit. Laſtly, if that had not been ſo, yet the high Prieſt was at hand vvith *Vrim* and *Thummim*, by which vvhen it was ſo eaſie to haue ſpeciall direction, vvho can thinke that *Salomon* would venture on ſuch a matter as this upon his own head? *But the contrary is proved* (ſaith the Def.) *becauſe a reaſon is rendred in the Text which moved Salomon to doe that he did.* As if theſe two could not ſtand together, to doe a thing upon ſome reaſon: and yet to doe it upon ſpeciall direction from God! ſee *Num.* 36. A ſecond anſwer is given by ſome of our Divines, that *Salomon did this out of the equity of Moſes law:* ſo *Junius cont.*3.*l.*4 *c.*19. To this the Def. replyes, *that this anſwer overthwarts the former.* Which is nothing ſo. For *Salomon* might be, and no doubt vvas in ſpeciall manner directed to ſee the equity of the Law, and ſpecially directed and authoriſed alſo to follow it. The Def. therfore is deceived in that advantage which he maketh of this anſwer.

A third anſwer is brought in by the Def. under the name of M. *Nic.* *viz.* that *God by his viſible deſcending approved of the worke of the Temple, and did authorize Salomon to doe that he did.* To whom the Def. vviſheth more leaſure, that he may look better upon the Text, vvhere *he ſhould not finde that God approved the Temple of Salomon by any viſible appearance, untill the ſacrifice was ended.* But if the Def. had had both leaſure and pleaſure to looke better upon the text, before he had cenſured another, then 1 he would haue ſeene that God appeared in the Temple before the ſacrifice was either ended or begun: 1 *King.*8 10 11 2 *Chron.*5 13 14. 2 He ſhould haue ſeene alſo that *Salomon* built the brazen Altar, not of his own head, nor upon a ſuddain which vvas impoſſible, but by the ſame direction that he did all the other holy things, 2 *Chron.*4 1. 3 He would not haue talked ſo looſely as he doth heere ſ. 20, vvhere no man can gather by his vvords, that he knoweth of any Altar appointed particularly of God, beſide the Altar of incenſe.

A fourth anſwer is, that vvhich *Daneus* giveth unto *Bellarmine*, *con.*3 *lib.*4 *c.*19, *viz.* that *this was not a new additament for kinde, but for ſome circumſtance onely; becauſe this Court was ſanctified by God, Exod.* 27 & 40, *and Salomon is ſaid to ſanctifie becauſe he put it to that uſe which was not ordinarie.* To this the Def. replyeth nothing vvorth the anſwering: but onely that he accuſeth M. *Nic.* and ſo in deed the Divines formerly alledged, of unconſtancie & unconſonancie: whereas the anſweres that haue been given may very vvell concurre all of them in one action, and one anſwer. The reſt of his talke doth hang upon the hornes of his new found brazen Altar: and there I leaue it.

SECT. XXII.

COncerning ſynagogues, I anſwer, 1. they were no ſignificant ceremonies about which the queſtion now is, 2. it is moſt likely though that the ſame Prophets vvhich erected ſchools, called ſchooles of the Prophets, were the firſt founders of thoſe ſynagogues. 3. ſeeing in the ſynagogues there was no ſignificant ceremony of action or apparrell, appointed by men, to bee uſed in them: therefore in the Chriſtian congregations, vvhich in forme of vvorſhip, (ſaving the addition of ſacraments appointed by God) is altogether the ſame with the ſynagogues, there ought much leſſe to be any.

SECT. XXIII. XXIIII. XXV. XXVI.

THe firſt example brought out of the New Teſtament, are the the feaſts of charitie, ordained (as the Def. ſayth) by the Apoſtles. To which our anſwer is ready, that if they were ordained by the Apoſtles, then they vvere not humane, but divine, and therefore nothing pertaining to our queſtion. To this the Defendants reply is, *that if divine be oppoſed unto conſtitutions not commanded of God, then we could not haue uttered a more unlearned poſition: becauſe all Divines diſtinguiſh betwixt divine, Apoſtolicall, and Eccleſiaſticall traditions.* All Popiſh Divines indeed doe allow of this diſtinction, becauſe it maketh for their purpoſe: and ſome of our Engliſh vvhen they vvrite in defence of the Hierarchie, or of the ceremonies: but ſo deeply to accuſe thoſe that refuſe it, for vvant of learning, this is too magiſteriall For 1. that vvhich came from the Apoſtles as they vvere Apoſtles, that came from the ſpirit of God, Act. 15. 28. 1. Cor. 7. 40. and to call that divine which hath the divine ſpirit of God: 1. God himſelfe for authour, vvhat vvant of learning is in this? 2 *Iunius* vvas a Divine, and learned, yet he ſayth, that this diſtinction betwixt Divine and Apoſtolicall traditions, is almoſt *imaginarie* and *ſuperfluous in Bell. cont.* 1. *lib.* 4. *c.* 2. *an.* 6. *Danæus* calleth it *a childiſh diſtribution, in eund. loc.* more learned divines, might eaſily be named, that doe ſo allow of this diſtinction. And indeed, to examine it by that learning, by vvhich diſtinctions are chiefly to be tried, it hath no Logick at all in it. For 1. the diſtinction pretended betwixt things appoynted for perpetuall uſe, and thoſe that may be altered upon occaſion: This diſtinction or difference (I ſay) is no way contained, in the tearmes *Divine, Apoſtolicall* 2. Some things vvere immediatly by Chriſt appointed, vvhich vvere not perpetuall;

tuall: as many things proper to the Apoſtles and their times. And ſome things appoynted by the Apoſtles which were to be perpetuall, as the eſſentialls of Eccleſiaſticall government.

A ſecond anſwer is brought in, *that theſe feaſts were abrogated by the Apoſtles. Then* (ſayth the Def.) 1. *they were not of divine inſtitution.* Not in that ſence indeed, which meaneth by divine perpetuall: but yet they might be divine, as gifts of tongues, healing, propheſying, &c. vvere. *Then* 2. (ſayth he) *the Church may inſtitute and abrogate as the Apoſtles did.* The conſequence is but faint: yet the conſequent or thing inferred, may be granted, ſo that the Church keep within her bounds. Our finall anſwer is, *That theſe feaſts of charitie were not of myſticall ſignification, nor yet meerly Eccleſiaſticall.* And indeed it is plaine, that theſe feaſts did carry no ordained ſignification, but that which nature her ſelfe had imprinted in their foreheads. For who knoweth not that familiar feaſting of poore and rich together, is a demonſtration and preſervation of loue, vvithout inſtitution? and yet this is all that the Def. can ſay for their ſignification. Neither were theſe feaſts merely Eccleſiaſticall or religious, becauſe they were uſed in the aſſemblies: for they were alſo uſed in the ſame manner, and to the ſame end, out of the aſſemblies. Their proper end was reliefe of the poore, and maintenance of brotherly loue.

Laſt of all, for the ordination of theſe feaſts, it cannot be ſhewed to haue been Apoſtolicall. *Peter Martyr* in 1. Cor. 11. 22. judgeth otherwiſe. So that in this example, the Def. can neither ſhew myſticall ſignification, religious ceremonie, nor Eccleſiaſticall ordination: and yet except all theſe be proved, the inſtance maketh nothing at all unto his purpoſe. But that which hee lacketh in weight of arguments, he ſtrives to make up in number.

SECT. XXVII.

THE next inſtance (like the former) is *the kiſſe of peace.* To vvhich our anſwer is, that *it was a naturall indicant ſigne of peace and reconciliation.* But the Def. borrowing light from ſome oratoriall phraſes of the Fathers, will proue the contrarie: though it be as manifeſt as any thing can be, both by Scripture, and alſo by other hiſtories, that it was a civill naturall faſhion uſed in thoſe parts upon ciuill occaſions as well as holy. Now what doth hee proue? *Firſt the inſtitution, ſo farre as it was not commanded by Chriſt, was humane.* This he affirmeth, but proveth not: and in his affirmation wavereth like a reed ſhaken with ſome winde. *So farre it was from Chriſt; and ſo farre it was from man:* and yet we heare not how farre from either. The plain truth is, it was of no inſtitution at all: but of naturall inclination and civill cuſtome, vſed long before the comming of Chriſt, as is to be ſeen every where in the old Teſtament, Gen. 29. 13. 1. Sam. 20. 41. &c. yet by direction or cuſtome it received conſtant application unto ſome ſpeciall acts. *Secondly*, he ſayth, *it was ſignificant*, that is, it had a naturall fitneſſe to declare the inward affection of loue. What is this to a ſignification impoſed by man? it vvas ſo ſignificant as ſhaking of hands: vvhich geſture alſo uſed to be joyned with it: *Tunc ambo nexi ad invicem dextras damus in oſculo pacis ſacræ, &c.* It did ſo ſignifie loue as the turning away of the face doth ſignifie alienation of minde. *But* (ſayth he) *it ſignified Chriſtian loue*. As if Chriſtian loue had not in it the common nature of loue, and therefore cannot be ſignified partly by naturall ſignes common to loue. Cleanlineſſe in the celebration of the ſacraments, is the ſame that it is at another feaſt; though in regard of that application, it may be called Chriſtian or holy cleanlineſſe or decencie. *Thirdly*, he ſayth, *it was uſed in time of holy worſhip*. So no doubt was giving of the upper place unto the Elders, &c. in token of reverence: and yet it was no religious inſtituted ſigne of myſticall ſignification: ſuch reaſons as theſe bewray more confidence then good conſideration.

SECT. XXVIII.

THe third and laſt example vvhich is brought out of Scripture, is, the covering and uncovering of the head at divine ſervice, 1. Cor. 11. to vvhich I anſwer as before, that it was a civill order of decencie, uſed as well out of Gods worſhip, as in it. But here the Def. taketh paines to make many collections, and confirme the ſame by divers witneſſes. *Becauſe* (as he ſayth) *this poynt is of ſome moment*; though the other were of none: let us therfore briefly conſider what they be.

1. *I would firſt learne* (ſayth he) *whether this ceremonie of covering and uncovering were not ſignificant of ſome good thing?* I anſwer, that this faſhion which he abuſiuely calleth a ceremonie, was ſignificant in a generall ſence: that is, it did declare or argue a good thing.

2 *I would ask what thing it is that is hereby ſignified?* I anſwer, ſubjection and ſuperiour power. *But there is a relation alſo to God*, ſayth the Def. I anſwer, there is in mans ſuperioritie, a kind of reſemblance of Gods ſoveraigntie: and ſo there is alſo, as *Calvin* obſerveth, *in omni principatu* in all ſuperiour power: ſo that this maketh covering and uncovering, no more a religious ſignificant ceremonie, then the upper ſeat of a heathen Magiſtrate ſitting in judgement: for by that ſeat is ſignified a ſuperioritie, in which there is ſome image of Gods ſovoraigntie. There is nothing alledged out

of our Divines by the Defendant, which may not as well bee applied to the Iudges bench, as to this covering and uncovering. And the Apoſtle doth ſhew plainly, that the vaile he ſpeaketh of, vvas of the ſame nature vvith long haire. So that, by the Def. reaſon, mens ſhort, and vvomens long haire, muſt be accounted religious myſticall ceremonies.

3 *Our third demand* (ſayth he) *is, whether theſe ceremonies of covering and uncovering, were not inſtituted to bee obſerved in Gods publicke worſhip*? I anſwer, it was required that they ſhould be obſerved in holy Aſſemblies. But 1. it was not onely required in Gods publick vvorſhip, but alſo as *Calvin* upon the place granteth, *In quovis graviore cœtu aut matronarum aut virorum,* in any graue meeting of men and women. And inſtit. lib 4. cap. 10. ſect. 29. *ne mulieres in publicum niſi velatæ procedant*: i. Whenſoever they goe into publicke places. 2. It was not inſtituted primarily and principally for Gods worſhip. If it were, I aske, vvhen and by whom? *Paul* ſurely did not inſtitute a new ceremony in this place: for v. 14. he groundeth his admonition upon *nature*, i. as *Calvin* well expoundeth it, vpon a received vſe and ancient cuſtome in thoſe parts: which ſome through lightneſſe began unſeemly to tranſgreſſe. There is nothing alledged out of *Martyr* or *Chryſoſtome* againſt this anſwer.

4 *Fourthly* (ſayth he) *wee deſire to know, whether this matter were not a thing indifferent*? I anſwer, it is indifferent in the generall nature of it; yet at that time, and in that place, they ſinned that did otherwiſe, even before *Paul*, or any of their overſeers, gaue them charge about it.

Laſtly, (ſayth he) *it is worthy our inquirie to learne how farre other Churches may be directed by this example*? I anſwer, ſo farre juſt as the Apoſtles rule ſtretcheth, 1. Cor. 14. 40. *Let all things be done comely*.

Now the Defendant hath a direct anſwer to all and every one of his demands, let him caſt up his ſumme, and he ſhall finde, that he hath proved juſt nothing. Hee could find but three examples in all the New Teſtament, vvhich had any colour, ſo as they might bee alledged for myſticall ceremonies, appropriated to Gods vvorſhip, by mans inſtitution. The *Loue-feaſts, the kiſſe of peace, and the vaile of women*. And yet there is not one of theſe three, (as any indifferent man, if he hath common ſenſe may ſee by that vvhich hath been ſaid) that can be ſhewed either to be of myſticall ſignification, other then nature giveth it, nor appropriated unto Gods worſhip more then to civill occaſions, nor yet ever inſtituted by any man in the Church of God. Is it not a marvellous thing that men ſhould preſume ſo as they doe to domineere in words and deeds over poore men, in ſuch things as they can ſhew neither precept nor patterne for in all the Scriptures.

We will deſcend lower, ſaith the Def. And that, I aſſure him, is his beſt courſe: for ſo long as he wadeth in the pure waters of holy Scripture, he doth but ſtriue againſt the ſtreame: deſcending lower to humane vvritings, he may finde the vvaters troubled, and ſo bring ſome fiſh to his net. Yet having the Scriptures on our ſide, vvee need not feare to follow him vvhether ſoever he pleaſeth to leade us.

SECT. XXIX.

HEere is alledged the univerſal cuſtome of the ancient Church, even from the Apoſtles times for confirmation of humane myſticall ceremonies in Gods vvorſhip. To vvhich I anſwer, 1 of the firſt and pureſt times, next after the Apoſtles, this cannot be proved: nor is likely, becauſe it is not to be thought that all Churches vvould immediately admit of any thing vvhich they had not received from the Apoſtles. 2 For the next ages it may eaſily be ſhewed, that the beſt Writers taught many generall rules concerning the perfection of Scripture, and the purity of Gods worſhip, vvhich cannot ſtand vvith theſe humane inventions: howſoever in their practiſe they vvere carried away unto other cuſtomes. 3 The infinite troubles of thoſe times againſt Infidels and Heretickes, about the chiefe grounds and maine foundations of faith, vvould not ſuffer them to examine theſe points of leſſe moment as they ſhould. And in deed, they vvere ſo taken up with thoſe conflicts, that they neglected many uſuall truths. So that if all ſhould be received vvhich the Fathers practiſed, neither any thing underſtood but by their interpretations, vve ſhould be deſtitute of much truth, and overcharged vvith the burthen of humane preſumptions, as *Auguſtine* complained in his time, *ep.* 119, 4 the Lord in juſtice vvould haue Antichriſt to prevail: which myſterie could never haue grown to any ripeneſſe, had the worſhip of God been preſerved ſincere. That corruption begot him, and the reformation thereof muſt be his utter ruine. It is ſufficient that the lamentable experience of fifteen hundred yeres hath declared unto us, vvhat fruit of ſignificant ceremonies brought by man into Gods worſhip are wont to affoord unto thoſe that affect them. To fetch authority in this caſe, from their practiſe, by which hath inſued ſuch ineſtimable hurt to the Church of God, is not the vviſedome of the burnt child, vvho dreadeth the fire.

SECT. XXX.

OF our own Writers the Def. heere oppoſeth unto us, *Calvin Iunius*, *Chemnitius* and *Zepperus*. Now for theſe, it hath been plainely manifeſted before, that they all vvith one conſent condemne humane ſymbolicall ceremonies in Gods worſhip: and that upon good grounds out of Gods word. Now therefore if any thing elſwhere hath fallen from any of them by occaſion, ſounding to the contrary, then we may well think that either] their meaning is miſtaken therin, or elſe they ſhewed themſelues to be men: and indeed (to ſay the truth) there is a little varietie to bee found in ſome of our divines concerning the poynt of ceremonies. But the cauſe thereof being marked, will make it leſſe offenſiue. All our Divines, when they look into the clear chryſtall of the ſcripture, condemne plainly all devices of man in Gods worſhip, whatſoeever: but againe, ſome of them when they fixe their eyes on the falſe gloſſe of ancient times, and conſider withall how hardly men are drawen from their accuſtomed vanities, and what good ſome men may doe by applying themſelves ſomewhat to the times, then receiving another kind of impreſſion, they ſeeme ſometime to vvaver in their words. This obſervation I thought fit to ſet down in generall, becauſe it may haue good uſe in ſome particular places which this Def. threatneth hereafter to object. But as for the places here quoted, the anſwer is eaſie.

Calvin in the firſt place, diſputing againſt the groſſe corruptions of the Papiſts, ſayth, he doth not contend therein about ceremonies, vvhich hee might truely ſay not onely comparatiuely, but even abſolutely in regard of contention with others, who did not obtrude them upon him. And ſo I am aſſured few or none would contend much about ceremonies, if they would not force them vpon others.

In the other place, he underſtandeth by ceremonies, ſuch as are given us of God: as the following words ſhew: *Paucæ igitur nobis divinitus datæ ſunt ceremoniæ.* What indeed he thought was to bee given to the rude people in this kinde, he ſhewed ſufficiently, not onely by his words formerly cited, but alſo by his practiſe, in that he baniſhed ſuch ceremonies utterly not onely out of Geneva, but alſo out of all Churches, vvhich hearkned vnto his counſell.

Chemnitius in regard that ſome ceremonies were in uſe where he lived, handleth them ſo gently as he can: and ſpeaketh too favourably of Images: yet in other places, the truth wreſteth from him and *Brentius* alſo, a right confeſſion, as hath been alledged before.

Zepperus meaneth onely that the ſimple having of Images in Churches is not ſuch impietie as doth unchurch a people.

Iunius and *Chemnitius* in the laſt place, doe but give a difference betwixt the Fathers and Papiſts uſe of ſome things. Here is nothing directly againſt our aſſertion. But if all theſe witneſſes did ſpeak as the Defendant would haue them in theſe places mentioned, what were that to the cloud of teſtimonies which are brought forth in the Abridgment, and unanſwered as yet by the Defender. His own mouth will teſtifie that our Divines are generally on our ſide. For in that regard (if he ſpeaketh with good reaſon) he calleth them ſtill *our owne witneſſes*. Our owne they are not, becauſe we alledge them onely: for ſo both Fathers, and Papiſts, and Conformiſts alſo are alledged by us: but becauſe they ſpeake plainly for us. Which appeareth alſo the more by his ſilence at the moſt part of their ſpeeches.

SECT. XXXI.

A*Fter much ſayling in the maine ſea*, the Defendant *directeth his courſe* (as he ſayth) *homeward to the narrow ſeas, by inſtancing in the practiſe of Non-conformiſts themſelues.* His compariſon is good: for as the ſcriptures were too deepe for him to faſten any anchor of a conforming argument in: ſo the practiſes of vveak men are ſo full of ſands and ſhelves, that here hee can haue no ſure riding. The ſea of Rome turned, by one of our Prelates, *mare Romanum*, is the beſt harbour of all the world for the ceremonies to arriue and reſt in.

The firſt example brought is the forme of an oath, vvhich is taken on a booke. To which I anſwer, 1. That if this forme of ſwearing can be proved to bee of the ſame nature with the croſſe in baptiſme, &c. we will rather abandon this forme to avoyd the Croſſe, then admit of the croſſe for loue of this. 2 I affirme, that it vvere much better that this forme (invented by Papiſts, and abuſed not onely by them, but alſo by many among our ſelues) were aboliſhed, as it is in other Countries not Popiſh, then reteined. *Mr. Fox.* Mr. W. *Thorpe* a Martyr, or Confeſſor, in King *Henry* the fourth his dayes, refuſed to ſweare upon a booke, alledging *Chryſoſtome* for the ſame opinion. 3. This forme if it bee vvorſhip, ſeemeth to be eſſentiall and neceſſarie vvorſhip, not accidentall: for no man is eſteemed to haue taken his corporall oath (as *Lindwood* affirmeth) but hee that ſweareth upon a booke. 4. It is not our practiſe to make any more of touching the book, then of lifting up of the hand, vvhich is uſed in other Countries: i. to make it a ſigne of aſſent unto that which is required of us. So that I for my part vvould not finde fault vvith thoſe vvhich ſometime hold out a ſervice-booke, or any other to touch and kiſſe: for it is all one vvhether we ſhew our aſſent one way or another, ſo it be ſhewen iu a decent manner. 5. This forme is not uſed in the ſpeciall ſolemne worſhip of God: but in a civill aſſembly, where occaſionally God is called upon for confirmation of the truth. And indeed, as the Def. ſpeaketh well, an oath is rather a cogniſance or note of ſupreame worſhip, then proper and direct vvorſhip.

SECT. XXXII.

THe next inſtance is, *The obſervation of the Lords day*: vvhich the Defendant would never haue brought in as an example of a humane ceremonie, if he had not either been ſea-ſicke or elſe ſleepie with his long ſayling which he ſpake of in the former ſection. For he taketh it for granted, that we hold the Lords day to be an inſtitution of man, vvhich we utterly deny: We hold, as *Iunius* anſwereth *Bell.* about this matter *de cult. ſanct.* l. 3. *c.* 10. *an.* 33. *c.* 11. *an.* 3. it is the divine inſtitution of Chriſt himſelfe.

By the vvay here he bringeth in a teſtimony of *Zanchius*, calling our Temples *types and ſhadowes of the celeſtiall Temple*. But *Zanchies* meaning was not to make them deſtinated inſtituted types: but onely ſuch things as by accommodation may ſerve fitly to put us in minde of ſuch a matter: even as any arbitrarie ſimilitude that is fit, may be called a tyde and ſhadow. I would the Defendant would read the very next Theſis of *Zanchie* to that hee quoteth: there he ſhould ſee, that Images, though they bee not for the preſent worſhipped, yet ought to be removed out of Churches, becauſe they helpe not but hinder the vvorſhip of God. If Images, then by the Def. own former grant, myſticall ceremonies of mans invention: and ſo myſticall Churches too.

SECT. XXXIIII.

IN this laſt ſection, ſome reaſon is promiſed for a finall confutation of the Non-conformiſts in this poynt; but I for my part can ſee none. *Nothing* (ſayth he) *is properly called a ceremony, if it be altogether deſtitute of ſignification.* Then (ſay I) away, and out of the Church with all ceremonies properly ſo called, of mans invention. But vvhy hath hee gone about to deceiue us ſo often before, by confounding circumſtances of order and decencie with other ceremonies, & now in the winding up of all, confeſſeth that they cannot be properly called ceremonies? ſurely there is no reaſon in this kind of dealing, but onely that which they call Sophiſtry.

Calvin (ſayth the Def.) *and ſome other, doe accuſe the Popiſh ceremonies becauſe they are dumbe*. I anſwer, they accuſe them alſo for ſpeaking, as the ſcripture doth condemne Images both for being dumb, and alſo for teaching lies. So that lay all together which thoſe Divines ſay, and you ſhall find that in their judgement, humane ceremonies in Gods worſhip, are like a foole in a place of honour, vvho vvhether hee ſpeaketh, or holdeth his peace, ſtill ſheweth himſelfe unworthy of that place.

CHAP. IIII. SECT. I.

THis argument in the Abridgement, *p.* 17. ſtandeth thus: *It is contrary to Gods word to uſe (much more to command the uſe of) ſuch ceremonies in the worſhip of God, as man hath deviſed, if they be notoriouſly knowen to have been of old, and ſtill to be abuſed unto idolatry or ſuperſtition by the Papiſts, ſpecially if the ſame be now of no neceſſarie uſe in the Church. But our ceremonies are ſuch: Ergo.*

The Defendants anſwer is very briefe: he dares not abſolutely deny either part of the argument. Hee could not finde a fit diſtinction whereupon to ground a conditionall deniall with reaſon: he contents himſelfe therefore to make a ſhew of diſtinguiſhing after an unreaſonable manner. For he doth not diſtinguiſh of any one tearme found in the argument: nor maketh the parts of his ſuppoſed diſtinction ſuch as will beare any Logicall ſence. *If* (ſayth hee) *you require ſuch ceremonies to bee aboliſhed, then wee deny your Major: but if you underſtand indifferent things, or meane an abſolute, not a convenient neceſſitie, wee deny your Aſſumption. If this* and *but if that*, this forme of ſpeech, as indeed, every diſtinction, implieth ſome diſſention and ſegregation in the parts diſtinguiſhed. But here is no ſhew of any ſuch thing, betwixt *aboliſhing* and *indifferencie*, or *abſolute neceſſitie*. I know not what to make of ſuch a confuſed diſtinction. It is as if one ſhould ſay, *If you require an eſtabliſhing of the ceremonies, I deny one thing; but if you underſtand convenient ceremonies, I deny another thing.* Such kind of ſpeaking is nothing elſe but *non ſence*, or as ſome uſe to call it, *a very bull*. Let this generall anſwer therefore paſſe: though he ſayth, that in it we may *ſee our marks, and take our aime.*

SECT. II.

THE Abridgement beginneth the proofe of the propoſition thus. This may appeare 1 by the ſecond Com: vvhich forbids all provocation unto ſpiritual fornication, as the ſeventh doth unto that which is carnall. 2 By the commandement and direction God hath given us in his vvord. 3 By the equity and reaſon of theſe commandements. Now the Def. though he profeſſeth a full anſwer to all that is objected, yet he ſilently paſſeth over the firſt proofe out of the ſecond Command. vvholly: and in the 2 and 3 proofe, vvhere about forty places of Scripture are cited for confirmation of them, he doth not attempt to anſwer aboue 8 or 9. But let us examine his anſwer to theſe.

Lev. 18 *&c. three kinde of things are forbidden, 1 inceſt, 2 rounding their heads and cutting their fleſh for the dead, 3 ſowing with diverſe ſeeds, and letting diverſe beaſts to ingender together. The firſt was a ſin againſt nature: the ſecond was a wicked cuſtome of infidelity: the third did ſignifie adulterie: in all which our ceremonies are innocent.* He anſwereth heere onely unto the places taken out of the 18 and 19 of *Lev.* concerning vvhich I reply 1 that in the firſt place the vvords are generall, v. 3 4: howſoever therefore in the following verſes they be applyed unto foule ſinnes, yet ſeeing in other places of Scripture the like application is made unto ceremonies, they vvere therfore mentioned as the generall ground, comprehending both kindes in it, and joyned unto other places condemning conformity vvith idolaters even in matters of ceremonie. 2 The ſecond and third vvere no more vvicked, nor yet ſo much in any reſpect among the Heathen, as our ceremonies haue been among the Papiſts: And therefore in theſe, M. *Calvins* collection in *Lev.* 19 27, is ſound. *God would haue his people to know, that they could not haue his favour, except they would in all points be unlike to ſuch, and goe as farre as they could from their faſhions and examples, eſpecially in thoſe rites wherein there was any ſhew of Religion.* 3 I vvould demand whether, if the high Preiſt, vvith the vvhole Synedrion of the Iewes lawfully aſſembled, had vvith one conſent decreed, that vvheras the Lord enjoyneth, *Lev.* 19 *Yee ſhall not ſow with diverſe ſeeds, nor cut round your heads, nor marre the tufts of your beards:* this vvas onely in regard of infidelity, and in reſpect of an evill ſignification: but ſeeing the things are in their nature indifferent, and that it might be convenient for them to uſe them, they vvould therefore all from thenceforth uſe the ſame, provided that none ſhould uſe them upon infidelity as the heathen did, nor make any evill interpretation of them: I vvould demand (I ſay) whether ſuch a decree ſhould ever haue been lawfully made, or vvarrantably obeyed ? I thinke the Def. vvill ſay no. But why? Perhaps becauſe of the expreſſe commandement to the contrary; but doth not this commandement then reſpect ſome other reaſon, beſide thoſe vvhich by this decree ſhould be now taken away? and may we not collect a further matter from them ?

SECT. III.

BEcauſe one uſuall evaſion, much eſteemed by the patrones of our ceremonies, is, that they had a good beginning: therfore the Authors of the Abridgement to ſtop that muſe, adde that *even ſuch things are to be caſt away, which had a good originall and uſe (if they be not ſtill neceſſarie and commanded of God) when once they are knowne to haue been defiled by idolatry, or abuſed unto it.* For proofe vvhereof they alledge *Lev.* 26 1, and other places more. But the Def. heere ſingleth out this one, and denyeth that the titulary pillars of the heathen (which vvere ſet up at limits of their grounds) had a good beginning. Suppoſe that this be true, and that the Authors of the Abridgment were miſtaken in this place: is not the ſame thing ſufficiently proved out of 2 *King.* 18 4, *Dan.* 1 8, *Hoſ.* 2 16 17. But yet it is more then probable, that thoſe titular pillars, vvere at the firſt onely ſet up for civill uſe: becauſe many ſtatues vvhich afterward ſerved onely for vvorſhip, vvere at the firſt onely for civill reſpects, and theſe had ſtill a civill uſe for diſtinction of bounds. *But Calvin collecteth, that no ſtatue was heere condemned, but that which was erected to repreſent God.* *Calvin* indeed hath thoſe words: but vvhat kinde of repreſentation he meaneth, he ſheweth ſufficiently before, *omnes picturas quibus corrumpitur ſpiritualis Dei cultus: all pictures that corrupteth Gods ſpirituall worſhip.* And after, *quæcunque nos a ſpirituali ejus cultu abducunt: whatſoever lead us from the ſpirituall worſhip of God.*

Iacob erected a pillar for a religious monument (ſaith the Def.) Gen. 28, true: but not after the Law vvas given againſt it: ſo alſo he offered ſacrifices, and many other things, in ſuch ſort as after the Law vvas not lawfull.

SECT. IIII.

THE third proofe in the Abridgement ſtandeth thus: *the equity of theſe commandements is thus ſet down in Scripture: 1 the deteſtation which the Lord our God being a jealous God beareth unto idolatry, and all the inſtruments and tokens thereof, as unto ſpirituall whoredome, Exod.* 20 5 6, *Deut.* 7 25 26. *2 that we cannot be ſaid* *ſincerely to haue repented of the idolatry or ſuperſtition whereby wee or our forefathers haue provoked the Lord unleſſe we be aſhamed of and caſt away with deteſtation all the inſtruments and monuments of it, 2 Chron.33 15, Eſ.1 29 & 2 20 & 30 22 2 Cor.7 11, Cal. in Deut. ſerm.52 ep.86 p.166 167. 3 that we ſhall be in danger to be corrupted Ex.34 12 15, Deut.7 4 25 26, Iud.2 13, Gal. 2 5. 4 Wee ſhall harden Idolaters, Ezech.16 54 1 Cor.6 10. 5 There is more danger in Popiſh ceremonies, becauſe the Pope is Antichriſt, and we converſe more with Papiſts then with other Idolaters.*

Now of all theſe reaſons and allegations the Def. anſwereth directly to nothing, but onely to thoſe words *ſee Calvin*: and yet not to them neither as they are cited in the Abridgement. For there it is, ſee *Calvin* in his 52 *ſerm.* on *Deut.* and ep.87. Now on theſe places the Defendants eyes vvould not ſerue to looke: or at leaſt, his heart would not ſuffer him to giue anſwer, they are ſo pregnant. *If we haue any drop of good zeale in us, it muſt needs vexe and grieue us to ſee the markes and ſignes of idolatry: and that we muſt to the uttermoſt of our power deface them, &c. nothing upon pretence muſt be tolerated in the Church, which came either from Satan or from Antichriſt.* Yet the Def. ſaith, he hath ſeen *Calvin* upon *Exod.* 23 & 24, and *Numb.*23 and *Deut.* 7 12, and findeth that *Calvin* holdeth theſe precepts of deſtroying Altars and Groues, to binde the Iewes onely, not Chriſtians: and he biddeth us ſee *Calvin* on theſe places. Surely I haue looked and could finde no ſuch thing. If there had been any thing vvorth the knowing, for maintenance of the ceremonies, we ſhould haue heard of the words of *Calvin*, whereas now *Calvin* is brought in expreſly affirming that we may uſe temples which haue been defiled vvith idoles: which is nothing at all to the queſtion of unneceſſary ceremon. But if the Def. would diſcuſſe this poynt out of Authors, vvhether the lawes alledged out of the old Teſtament againſt the monuments of Idolatry, doe not bind Chriſtians, why doth he not anſwer to the teſtimonies of *Calvin, Martyr, Grineus, Wolphius, Viſinus, Machabeus, Zanchius, Simlerus, Zepperus, Fulk*, & our book of homilies alledged to this purpoſe in the Abridg.p.24.

SECT. V.

IN one place of Scripture yet, *viz. Dan.* 1 8, the Def. thinketh he hath ſome advantage; becauſe *Calvin* interpreteth it otherwiſe then of ceremoniall pollution. But therein the Abridgement followed that interpretation which is moſt generally receiued: for which ſee *Iunius* in his Commentary upon the place. And ſuppoſe that pollution vvas not ceremoniall or idolatrous, yet I hope the Def. vvill not ſay but if the meat had been ſo polluted,

polluted *Daniel* vvould haue abſteyned from it.

Take therefore ſome other teſtimonies to proue your aſſertion, ſaith the Def. So confidently as if he knew of no teſtimonies vvhich he had not anſwered. What can one ſay to him that vvill not take that which is thruſt into his hands, and yet calleth for more, as if he could finde none?

SECT. VI.

THE laſt thing vvhich the Def. vvill take knowledge of, as alledged out of the Scriptures, in this point, is the example of *Hezekiah* 2 King. 18 in breaking down the brazen Serpent. This example is ſo famous, that he could not omit it: yet he knoweth not vvell what to ſay unto it.

Firſt, he giveth fiue reaſons for the aboliſhing of the brazen ſerpent. As if any of us doubted, but that *Hezekiah* had reaſon enough for that he did: Or, as if there could not be reaſons enough alledged, and thoſe almoſt the very ſame, for aboliſhing of our ceremonies. Let them be aboliſhed by publick authority, and I vvill undertake reaſons to juſtifie, the action done, vvill eaſily be acknowledged even of thoſe that now can ſee none to perſwade unto the doing of it.

Secondly, he propoundeth, as very obſervable, that *Hezekiah* did not aboliſh the idols vvhich *Salomon* ſuffered to be ſet up, becauſe they were neglected. But 1 it may vvell be thought that thoſe idols vvere deſtroyed by *Hezekiah*, and ſet up againe before the time of *Ioſiah*, as many other ſuperſtitions were. 2 It cannot be doubted but they ſhould haue been deſtroyed, even though they were for the time neglected: becauſe either *Hezekiah* had as good cauſe to deſtroy them as *Ioſiah*: or elſe he might haue prevented that cauſe which *Ioſiah* had: and to prevent evill, we are as well bound, as to correct it.

Thirdly, he citeth *Zanchius* to proue, that this is not an univerſall remedy for all abuſes of ceremonies. The place in *Zanchie* I cannot finde: neither ſkilleth it much. I grant the concluſion, it is not a remedy for all abuſes of ceremonies, *viz.* for ſuch as Gods appointment hath made neceſſary to be retayned. Beſides the words of *Zanchie* heere cited by the Def. doe onely therfore ſeem to make for him, becauſe they are not full enough againſt him. But in other places of the ſame book *Zanchius* judgement is plain enough, as *p.649* vvhere from this example he reproveth thoſe that keep the reliques of ſuperſtition in ſome holy places, though they haue removed them out of Churches. And if about this matter the Def. doth aſcribe any thing to the judgement of our divines, vvhy doth he not anſwer the teſtimonies of *Auguſtine*, *Calvin*, *Martyr*, *Wolphius*, *Lavater*, *Zanchius*, *Sadeel*, *Iewel*, *Bilſon*, *Fulk*, *Rainolds*, *Andrews*, *Perkins*, alledged to this purpoſe in the Abridgement, p. 24?

Fourthly and laſtly (vvhich onely in deed is to the purpoſe) the Def. vvould ſhew us a diſparity betwixt the idolatry of the Iewes, and that of the Papiſts. The firſt is, that *that idolatry of the Iewes was done publickely, and generally, and in the bowels of the ſame Church: but the Papiſts is not ſo.* To which I anſwer 1 theſe circumſtances are not rendred as reaſons of the aboliſhing in the text, but invented by the Def. 2 private particular idolatry is to be removed as well as publick and generall: 3 all theſe circumſtances did more then agree to our ceremonies in the beginning of our reformation. And ſure they are not grown better ſince, by any good that they haue done.

The ſecond difference vvhich the Def. imagineth, is that there was no other meanes to cure the idolatry of thoſe times: but now there is. I anſw. 1 this is the very queſtion whether there be any other ſufficient meanes to cure the diſeaſe of humane ceremonies idolatrouſly abuſed beſide aboliſhing. 2 It is a vaine imagination vvhereby this difference is confirmed, and no reaſon at all. *In the Dominions of our Ezekias* (ſaith the Def.) *this diſeaſe would be found curable without any ſuch extremity.* But the experience of 50 or 60 yeares ſhew, that hitherto it is not cured neither in Ireland, nor Wales, to ſay nothing of England. Surely our Prelates are miſerable Phiſitions, that in a diſeaſe ſo eaſie to be cured, ſuffer the patients to languiſh under their hands, unto death. *Eſpecially* (ſaith he) *in this our moſt truely reformed Church, which doth moſt liuely expreſſe the face and full body of her primitiue mother Church.* This he hath now 3 or 4 times repeated: as if he did deſire to make a queſtion of it: and here propounds it vvith a doubt, *if you will allow.* It is not fit heere to make a long digreſſion about this matter. In ſhort therefore thus, vve allow with all thankefulnes, that our Church is to be called a reformed Church in regard of the main points of faith, which are purely and freely taught among us vvith publick approbation: and alſo in regard that the groſſeſt ſuperſtitions are by publick authority caſt out of our Aſſembles. But if our Eccleſiaſticall government be conſidered, and ſome ceremonious ſuperſtions, wee deny utterly, that vve haue ſuch a reformation therin, as may repreſent the face of the primitiue Church. Let the Defendant tell us, if ever the primitiue Church had ſuch chanting idol ſervice as is every day to be ſeen in our Cathedrall Churches? If there were in the primitiue Church Chancellors, Commiſſaries, Officials under the

Biſhops, which executed the cenſures of that Church? If he can ſhew any primitiue pompous Biſhops that had ſole authoritie of ordination & excommunication? If any Miniſter was called in the primitiue Ch. without expreſſe conſent of the congreg. over which he vvas ſet? if Miniſters vvere then vvont to goe to law for their places? if the Primitiue Church ever heard of Pluraliſts, Non-reſidents or dumb miniſters? If either in primitue or elſe in Popiſh Church almoſt ſimony was ever ſo ordinary as it is with us? If ever ſo many prophane men, openly known to be contemners of Religion, vvere members of any primitiue Church, as are of ours? If ever he read of ſuch carnall proceedings about Eccleſiaſticall affaires in primitiue times, as are every day practiſed in our ſpirituall-courts? who tooke money for ordination, citation, abſolution, or change of pennance?

I will not inſiſt on theſe things, becauſe they are beſide our preſent queſtion; but onely deſire the Def. to behold this face which I haue deſcribed in a right glaſſe, and ſee if it be the face of the pure primitiue Church.

SECT. 7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19,20.

THE teſtimonies of Councels and Fathers, alledged in the Abridgement about this point, are largely ranked by the Def. into 14 Sections, as if the maine burden of this Controverſie did lye upon their authority: vvheras in the Abridgement they are briefly mentioned as illuſtrations. I vvill therefore according to the intent of thoſe vvhich alledged them, conſider all together.

7 In the fift Councell of Carthage it is true, that he ſaith, thoſe Altars vvere onely expreſly appointed to be aboliſhed, vvhich were ſet up vvithout reliques of Martyrs. But let the Def. ſhew any reaſon, why thoſe alſo were not to haue the ſame meaſure vvhich had reliques of martyrs in them? Surely the Councell ſeemeth to aime at a perfect reformation: but ſtayed at this, becauſe of the ſuperſtition vvhich then prevailed among the people, as they ſhew in that parentheſis (*ſi fieri poteſt*) *if it may be*: and in the next Canon.

8 *In the next canon* (ſaith the Def.) *they would onely haue immediate inſtruments of Idolatry then brought into publicke uſe aboliſhed.* But how doth he gather this gloſſe out of the Text? Or wherein doth this gloſſe excuſe our ceremonies, eſpecially as they were in the beginning of our reformation? and ſince they haue mended as ſoure Ale doth in ſummer.

9 To the decree of the Councell of Bracara, forbidding men to decke their houſes &c. in ſuch manner and at ſuch time as idolaters did, the Def. anſwereth nothing that hath any ſhew of reaſon in it. For our ceremonies differ nothing from the Papiſts in place, perſons, time, but onely in ſome opinion: Now the Councellthere doth not forbid the opinion, but the ceremony,even to them vvhich were of a better opinion.

10 The Councell of Affrick doth giue a reaſon why they condemned certaine feaſts, becauſe, *they were drawn from the errours of the Gentiles*. Heerein I am ſure it maketh againſt our ceremonies.

11 To *Tertullian de Coron*. the Def. ſaith leſſe then nothing.For he doth not ſpeake of the ſame individuall habite which was uſed to idolatry,as the Def. vainely pretendeth:nor of that kind which was onely uſed in idolatrous worſhip. For in the ſame book c.13, he ſaith this habit of a garland vvas uſed in moſt baſe places, as playes, ſtewes, jakes &c.

12 The like anſwer is given unto *Tertullian de Orat.* 1 in generall it is ſaid, that *Tertullian doth not condemne theſe ceremonies meerly for reſemblance with idolaters: but for opinion of efficacie and neceſſity*: wheras the contrary is plaine in *Tertullian*, for he ſaith expreſly, *Propterea in nobis reprehendi meretur, quod apud idola celebratur. Therefore it is to be blamed in us, becauſe it is uſed before Idols*: And B. *Jewel Def. Apol.* vvith many other of our beſt Writers againſt the Papiſts doe urge theſe teſtimonies of *Tertullian* meerely in regard of reſemblance. 2 *In waſhing* (ſaith the Def.) *ſome did then hold an opinion of efficacie and neceſſitie.* If they did, that is nothing to the purpoſe; for they might be condemned in that behalfe, and yet meerely alſo for reſemblance vvith idolaters. But no ſuch thing appeareth in *Tertullian*, he telleth us plainely, that the vvaſhing before prayer vvas a ſignificant ſign in remembrance of Chriſts delivering unto the Iewes by *Pilate*, when he had waſhed. *Cum ſcrupuloſe percontarer, & rationem requirerem, comperi commemorationem eſſe in domini deditionem, c. 11*, ſo that I doe not ſee but that this vvaſhing vvas every way like unto our ſigne of the croſſe in regard of the originall ſignification and uſe of it. 3 *In the ceremony of doffing cloakes before prayer, there was an opinion of neceſſity, becauſe Tertullian ſaith, ſi ſic oportet, if this ought to bee done.* As if *ſic oportet, ought to be done*, ought alwaies to be expounded of an abſolute neceſſitie. Doe not our Prelates now ſay, *ſic oportet*, vve ought to uſe the ceremonies, and yet diſclaime this opinion of neceſſity? *Tertullian* onely condemneth, *Vacua obſervatio, vanitas, quæ ſine ullius dominici aut apoſtolici præcepti authoritate fit, atque adeo ſuperſtitioni deputanda.* All theſe agree to our ceremonies

nies as well as to that. 4 *For ſitting upon beds after prayer, the opinion of neceſſity is onely condemned by Tertullian* (ſaith the Def.) *becauſe he inferreth, otherwaies we ought not to pray but ſitting* But that inference is onely upon an allegation out of *Hermas* vvhich *Tertullian* oppoſeth to himſelfe about the matter. Concerning the ceremony it ſelfe, the grounds of his condemnation are, *perinde faciunt nationes: apud idola celebratur.* So that the Defendant hath given no colourable anſwer unto *Tertullian.* Yet one thing he cannot conceale, though it be nothing to the purpoſe, *viz.* that *Tertullian in that place condemneth ſitting at prayer, which we bring up our Schollers unto.* He might ſurely haue concealed this, as being a ſhameleſſe ſlander in regard of us, as all that know us can vvitneſſe: and a ſhamefull practiſe of our Prelats, generally in all prayers before and after Sermons, except it be vvhen the Lords prayer is repeated: for it is vvell known how little reſpect they giue unto any prayers, but onely to the Lords prayer, and thoſe that are in the Service-book.

13 *Melchiades* forbad faſting at the ſame time vvith Pagans. *That was* (ſaith the Def.) *becauſe they lived in the ſame Conutrey, at the ſame time and place* Nothing elſe he hath to anſwer. And doth Countrey, time and place, make ſuch a difference, that the ſame ceremonies in one Countrey, time and place, ſhall be Chriſtian, and in another Paganiſh? What if the Countries be vvithin halfe a daies ſaile, as France is to England, and the time be the ſame, as it is in our caſe? confeſſe the truth, and ſhame the devill.

14 *Ambroſe* diſſwaded *Monica* from bringing of vvine and cakes to the Church. *There is no proportion* (ſaith the Def.) *for that was an act of ſacrificing performed by women, who are forbidden to ſacrifice, as well as to preach: deviſed by private perſons: of an idolatrous invention.* The firſt of which anſweres is *Bellarmines de ſanct. beat. l.1.c.14*, but evidently falſe. For the Papiſts themſelues are not ſo groſſe as to confeſſe that they offer any proper ſacrifice unto any creature whatſoever, *Bellat. de ſanct. beat. lib.1 cap.12*: and ſhall we thinke the mother of *Auguſtine*, with other religious women in thoſe purer times to haue been guilty of ſo great impiety? *Epiphanius* may call it a ſacrifice in a rhetoricall phraſe, becauſe it was an offering: but in diſputations we muſt ſpeake properly, yet *Epiphanius* doth call it onely an offering. 2 the perſon or ſexe of a woman, maketh no difference. For *Monica* was not the inventer and appointer, but onely the actor: and a woman may bring her offering and lay it upon the Communion table as well as a man. 3 It doth not appear that this was the invention of private perſons: there haue been Biſhops vvhich haue fathered as good children as

this was: and I do not know why ſuch a thing, or any ſignificant ceremony may not be lawfully uſed upon privat devotion, if it bee lawfull for men to impoſe it. 4. If that vvhich *Monica* did vvas Idolatrous, it is the very thing for vvhich our ceremonies are accuſed. 5. Laſtly, neither *Ambroſe, Auguſtine*, or *Monica* regarded theſe things in condemning of that act: for the reaſons are onely two *Ne ulla occaſio ingurgitandi ſe daretur ebrioſis: & quia illa quaſi parentalia ſuperſtitioni gentilium eſſent ſimillima.* The latter of which, viz. *reſemblance of Pagans*, is that vvhich vve urge.

15 To a graue ſentence of *Auguſtine*, counſelling to forſake all the toyes of Pagans, if vve vvould winn them, nothing is anſwered but that theſe toyes are not to be uſed *together With Pagans*, as if apart ſome of thoſe toyes at the leaſt may be profitably uſed. Surely to return his own phraſe upon him, *de bove & ejus cauda*, if others wil eat up the oxe, this Def. wil make no bones of the taile, ſo it be apart.

16 The Councel of Nice decreed that Chriſtians might not keep the feaſt of Eaſter at the time, or in the manner as the Iewes did. *Not* (ſayth the Def.) *that it Was alwayes unlawful ſo to do*, which queſtion I vvil leave to them that are skilful in human traditions, but 1. *for hatred of the Iewes.* 2. *becauſe of the Iewes inſultation.* 3. *for uniformitie.* The laſt of theſe cauſes doth not agree: for vniformitie might as well haue followed, if all Chriſtians could have been drawen to the ſame time with the Iewes. The other two agree vvel to our ceremonies. For we are to hate the idolatrous ſuperſtitions of the Papiſts vvith a perfect hatred. And the Papiſts do inſult ouer us for this, that *We haue borrowed our ceremonies from them*, as is to be ſeen in the Abridg. p. 25. where much is ſayd to this purpoſe, & by the D. unanſwered. And I vvould fain know for what cauſes other ceremonies of the Papiſts are aboliſhed, if not theſe, or for ſuch at the leaſt as would ſweep away our ceremonies in controverſie, as vvell as them, if it pleaſed them that haue ſuch bezomes in their hands?

17 *The Councell of Gangren forbad faſting on the Lords day onely* (ſayth the Def.) *if it Were in contempt of Chriſtian profeſſion.* But *Auguſtine Ep.* 86. telleth us the true reaſon vvas becauſe the heretickes did teach men to doe ſo, *ſacra ſolemnitate ſtatuta*, with religious ſolemnitie, as the Papiſts now doe in the Croſſe. And whereas the Defen. asketh, if there be any contempt of any Chriſtian article in our ceremonies: I anſwer, the croſſe cannot be otherwiſe uſed, then with preiudice, diſgrace, and ſo ſome kinde of contempt caſt upon baptiſme.

18 The 1 councel of Bracar forbad abſtinence frō fleſh, that Chriſtians might ſhew themſelves to differ from Priſcillianiſts, the Def.

anſwer is, *that the Papiſts do not conſort with us in the ſame ceremoniall acts as the Priſcillianiſts did with the Catholicks, at the ſame ordinaries & banquets.* But there is no ſuch reaſon rendred, or limitation ſet in the councell, of the ſame ordinaries and banquets: the ſame ceremonie onely is condemned.

19 Thrice-dipping in Baptiſme was condemned by a Councel of Toledo, approved by *Leo*, becauſe it was the cuſtome of Heretickes. *This was* (ſayth the Def.) *becauſe an hereticall conſtruction was made of it.* Even ſo (ſay we) a ſuperſtitious conſtruction is made of our croſſe, not onely by the Papiſts, but by our owne canons and Canonicall impoſers of it.

20 *Leo* forbidding men to have any thing to do with hereticks, *meaneth it onely of doctrinal conference*, ſayth the Def. But conformitie with them in their ceremonies is a greater fault (for the nature of it) then doctrinall diſputing with them. Therefore the teſtimonie holdeth, from the leſſe to the greater.

Thus in briefe I haue examined his particular anſwers unto our teſtimonies out of Councells and Fathers. Bnt one anſwer might haue ſerved for all, viz. that they were not brought in by the Authors of the Abridgement for to make an immediat concluſion by againſt our ceremonies, as the Def. in his anſwers evermore taketh them: but to illuſtrate the propoſition vvhich condemneth conformitie with Idolaters in their ceremonies. And herein wee haue not onely the Fathers, but even the Papiſts themſelues in words many times conſenting with us. *Suarez. in Thom. p. 3. q. 65.* maketh it one rule which the Church is to follow in appointing of ceremonies.

Now the Def. paſſeth from the propoſition of this argument, unto the aſſumption. But he ſhould haue done vvell to haue made a little ſtand at the armie of Proteſtants vvhich are brought in as giving witneſſe to this truth. Abridg. p. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. & 25. why had we not heare one head of *Proteſtant Divines*, as vvell as in the former arguments, ſeeing more are cited here then in them? Surely the Def. could not tel how to giue a colorable anſwer to ſo many pregnant teſtimonies, and therfore thought good to paſſe them over in ſilence, and make his reader beleeve, that none were objected, becauſe none are anſwered.

SECT. XXI.

THe Def. here meaning to ſay ſomething againſt the aſſumption, ſetteth it down by halves, or rather by quarters. For the aſſumption is, Abridg. 26. 27. *our ceremonies in queſtion are humane inventions, of no neceſſary uſe, and abuſed to idolatry.* He ſetteth it thus downe, *our ceremonies haue been idolatrouſly abuſed by Papiſts.* There is great difference, as by and by we ſhal ſee. His anſwer is by a diſtinction: *Theſe ceremonies are either generally or individually and numerally the ſame that haue beene abuſed to idolatry: If generally, then it hindereth not, but they may ſtill lawfully bee vſed, though they haue been ſo abuſed. If individually, then it is not true which is affirmed: neither doth it follow from thence, that they muſt be aboliſhed, becauſe they haue been ſo abuſed, except they be the ſame formally*: i. *in intention and opinion of thoſe that impoſe and practiſe them.* What miſerable ſhifts is the Def. put to? he told us before, his diſtinctions were wedges: but this is a very pick-lock, made for to open the doores of Gods Church into thoſe ceremonies againſt vvhich by the keyes of Gods kingdome they are ſtreightly ſhut up. For by this meanes any kind of Popiſh, Iewiſh, Heatheniſh ceremonie may come in, ſo there be new particulars of the ſame kinde, and a new intention uſed. The firſt aſſertion is moſt groſſe, viz. *that in ceremonies abuſed to Idolatry, thoſe are not forbidden which are generally the ſame, but onely the ſame individualls.* For by the like reaſon, of ceremonies inſtituted by Chriſt, thoſe onely are commanded which Chriſt individually and numerally did ſanctifie: not all of the ſame kinde. So alſo Papiſts are iuſtified againſt all the charges of our divines, who accuſe them for uſing of Iewiſh and Heatheniſh ceremonies: for they are not the ſame individually and numerally, but onely in kinde with thoſe vvhich Iewes and heathens uſed. So the meaning of the ſcripture, forbidding conformitie with the heathen Idolaters, ſhould onely be of uſing the ſame particular rites and ceremonies with them: as if when the cutting of their heads, & rounding of their haire like the heathen, vvas forbidden to the Iſraelites, *Lev.* 18. & 19. there had been danger leſt the people of Iſrael ſhould either get heathen mens heads, and ſet them upon their ſhoulders, or heathen mens beards, and ſet them upon their faces, and then put them into the forbidden faſhion. It is but folly to confute largely ſuch a beggarly aſſertion.

But *if* (ſayth the Def.) *the ſame generally be forbidden, then you cannot juſtifie any one of your owne ceremonies of order and decencie.* Why ſo? *becauſe there is no geſture or circumſtance of worſhip which hath not been abuſed to Idolatry.* Now he ſheweth plainly wherefore hee ſet downe onely a peece of the aſſumption: for if the reader marke, that our aſſumption is onely of *ceremonies deviſed by man, and of no neceſſarie uſe,* then he ſhall ſee that this poore obiection concerning circumſtances of order and decencie, can haue no place here: for they are of neceſſarie uſe in their kinde, neither are they meere inventions of man, as the ceremonies are, by *Bellarmines* owne confeſſion, *de effect. ſacr. lib.* 2. *c.* 29. For the ſecond, *that our ceremonies* *are not individually the ſame which the Papiſts haue ſolemnly abuſed to Idolatry*,if this be granted,it is no marvel : for it is altogether impoſſible to carry the ſame particular ſigne of the croſſe,ſo far as from the font to the Church doore : or to keep it in being,ſo long as it is in making. Hath not the Def. then found out a great ſubtil myſterie in this diſtinction ? yet it ſeemeth more true,that the Papiſts doe give divine honor unto the ſame individual ceremonies which are uſed in England : eſpecially to the ſigne of the croſſe as it is uſed among us. For *Bellarmine* aſcribeth divine honour and operation unto the ſigne of the croſſe as it was uſed by heathens, by Iewes,by *Iulian* the Apoſtate,*Bell.de eff. ſacr.l. 2.c.* 31. Though the Papiſts count us hereticks,and I know not what, yet they eſteeme us not vvorſe then Pagans,unbeleeving Iewes,& curſed Apoſtates. Seeing therefore they yeeld ſuch honor to this ſigne as it was uſed by them,they cannot deny it unto our individuall croſſes.

The laſt conceit,*that our ceremonies are not formally the ſame with the Papiſts,becauſe we haue another intention and opinion of them then they, and therfore need not be aboliſhed*,is as vain as the former. For(not to diſpute here of materiall and formall identitie) 1. a very ſhew of Idolatry muſt be abſtained from and aboliſhed. 2. It cannot bee ſayd ſimply and truely,that our intention and opinion concerning the ceremonies,is not the ſame with the Papiſts. For we haue no intention or opinion in the uſe of the croſſe, or other ceremonies, but the Papiſts haue the ſame : onely they haue ſome other opinions about theſe things vvhich wee haue not. And if this doth make a ceremonie not the ſame,that men haue not altogether the ſame opinion of it,then among the Papiſts there are alſo as many kinde of ceremonies,croſſes,Surplices,&c. as there is diverſitie of opinion about their nature and uſe,vvhich no man wil ſay. 3. the Altar erected by *Vria*,2.*King*. 16. vvas an idolatrous Altar,like that of Damaſcus,though it vvas for another intention. 4. the Papiſts doe aſcribe divine honour to the ceremonies uſed vvith our intention , as formerly vvas ſhewed out of Bellarmine. 5. This is the Papiſts anſwer vvhen they are accuſed for ſymbolizing with Pagans and Iewes in their ceremonies : *Licet in externo ſymbolo ſit aliqua ſimilitudo,abſolute tamen maximum eſt diſcrimen : nam à fine & intentione ſumunt externæ actiones ſpeciem ſuam. Bell.de effect. ſacr. lib.* 2.c.31.

SECT. XXII.

HEre, as a ground of confutation , the Def. ſetteth downe the profeſſion of the Church of England : vvhich becauſe hee drawes no concluſion from, it is not needfull to examine, though it cannot be defended,that the moſt abuſed ceremonies are taken away (as this profeſſion telleth us) becauſe no one ceremony among the Papiſts hath been ſo much abuſed as the croſſe. That therefore onely I would haue here marked, how this profeſſion doth confute this Defender. For he would make us beleeve, that none of the old ceremonies uſed in Poperie, are reteined, becauſe they are not formally the ſame in reſpect of intention and opinion. But this profeſſion telleth us plainly, that *ſome of the old ceremonies doe remaine.*

SECT. XXIII.

NO example can the Defendant find in all the booke of God, for lawfull reſerving of Idolatrous ceremonies, but only two; one of *Gedeon, Iudg.6.26.* and another of *Ioſhua, Ioſ. 6.19.* and yet of *Gedeons* example, the Def. himſelfe confeſſeth, that it vvas by ſpeciall commandment from God: and that it is not every vvay imitable. And of *Ioſhuas*, beſide that it was alſo the expreſſe commandement of God; and that there is no mention made of things appropriated unto Idolatry, but onely of goods which had been the poſſeſſion of Idolaters: ſo that he may fetch as good an argument and better, from the Spaniſh Cruſadoes, for the croſſe in baptiſme, then from the riches of Iericho. It doth no way appeare in the text, but that the veſſells were firſt molten, and then the gold onely, and the ſilver, braſſe or yron of them, brought into the tabernacle. So that by this wretched penurie of Scripture proofes, it is manifeſt, that the vvarrant for reteining of humane Idolatrous ceremonies, muſt be fetched out of another court, then that vvhich God holds in his holy word.

SECT. XXIIII.

I Had thought verily that the Def. would haue brought ſome pregnant teſtimonies out of the Fathers, though he could finde none in the holy Scriptures. But he is here alſo as farre to ſeeke as before: for he bringeth nothing at all vvorth the anſwering. The feaſt of Eaſter (which now the fourth time is brought upon the ſtage by the Def. in vain) was never generally obſerved at the ſame time with the Iewes, nor ever ſo appointed by any decree or canon of Councel: if it had, yet that had been but an agreement in a circumſtance of time, and the tranſlation of it to another time, did ſhew, they liked of no conformitie of Iewes. *There were feaſts alſo appoynted at times differing from hereticks.* What Cart-rope will draw a concluſion from hence for conformity with idolaters in their ceremonies? Beſides, feaſts & faſts, he nameth *habits*, but giveth no inſtance or proofe at all of any ſuch thing. Circumciſion, he ſayth, was continued under many Chriſtian Biſhops of Ieruſalem. But let him ſhew that thoſe Chriſtian Biſh. allowed of any ſuch thing.

I neuer heard nor read of more confident concluſions out of ſuch beggarly premiſſes.

SECT. XXV.

THe reaſons had need be ſtrong, when they come without any teſtimonie of Scripture,and antiquitie. But here the Defendant is as much forſaken of all helpe, as he vvas in the other. His firſt reaſon is,becauſe *hereticks haue perverted the ſacraments*. Now he knew that the queſtion is of humane ceremonies, not of Gods holy inſtitutions: therfore he fetcheth about, and draweth this to his purpoſe, by gathering from thence,that *it is almoſt impoſſible to finde any ceremony without exception.* All which we grant,of human ſignificant ceremonies,as he knoweth well: except therefore hee be reſolved to make a trade of begging the queſtion, I know not vvhat he ſhould meane by this unreaſonable reaſon.

SECT. XXVI. XXVII.

THe very ſame diſeaſe is found in his ſecond reaſon: vvherout he can conclude nothing,but that ſome things abuſed may afterward be rightly uſed; vvhich vve vvillingly grant: nay, it may be granted of ſome human ceremonies alſo: as if the Surplices of England were turned into under garments for poore people: and vvoodden croſſes were given them for firing. But if any conclude from hence, that therfore they may haue lawfull ſtate in Gods vvorſhip,and there haue a good uſe, ſurely his wit & words might bee better uſed.

In the 27 ſection there is no ſhew of any reaſon at all, except affirmations bee reaſons.

SECT. XXVIII.

THE laſt reaſon is, becauſe *Poperie and Popiſh rites are not to be eſteemed of equall abomination with Paganiſme and Paganiſh rites.* Suppoſe this vvere true every way (as it is not) yet in this they may agrree, that both alike are to bee deteſted and abandoned. Nay,a leſſer ſuperſtition the authors and countenances wherof are neere at hand, doth call for more haſtie removall, then a greater, whoſe authours and uſers are vnknown. Howſoever, vvhen the ſcriptures bid us flie from Idolatry, and that alſo particularly, from Popiſh Idolatries without any diſtinction, as from *Divells*, Ap. 18. a few ſmoothing vvords cannot ſatisfie our conſciences in this, but that wee are as well and as farre to flie from

Popiſh Idolatry, as from Paganiſh. But if the Defendant vvould haue throughly diſcuſſed this queſtion, vvhy did hee not anſwer that vvhich Mr. *Parker* hath to this purpoſe? p.1.c.1.S.25. or that vvhich is alledged in the Abridgement,p.24.

SECT. XXIX.

OVR Witneſſes can give the Defendant but ſmall aid,being ſeparated from ſcripture and reaſon;yet he catcheth at three, *Calvin*, *Martyr*, and *Zepperus*. *Calvin* (ſayth he) *teacheth that there is great difference betwixt Turks and Papiſts, lib.de vitand superſt.* True, but in the ſame place hee anſwereth the conſequence vvhich you would make from hence, viz. that therefore vvee need not flie ſo farre from Popiſh ſuperſtition,as from heathen: and in the ſame place alſo hee argueth from Turkes to Papiſts. *Calvins purpoſe was not to condeme any thing but that which is evill in it ſelfe.* True,in that diſcourſe vvherein he dealeth againſt thoſe vvhich could ſwallow downe the maſſe it ſelfe: it had been no vviſedome to diſpute vvith them about Croſſe and Surplice. *Hee alloweth of Temples which haue been abuſed to Idolatry.* So doe we, becauſe they are not religious ceremonies, of myſticall ſignification, vvithout neceſſarie uſe. And is this all that can bee brought out of *Calvin*? Then ſurely hee doth not contradict the many ſentences of condemnation vvhich as other where, ſo alſo in that very Tractate,he paſſeth againſt Idolatrous reliques.

Zepperus is alledged as allowing of Temples,which haue been abuſed,becauſe they were not immediat inſtruments of Idolatry. So doe we allo,as before I ſayd, for that and other cauſes. But altars in the ſame place he condemneth: which yet are retained in our Cathedrall Churches,and I hope the croſſe being an Idoll it ſelfe,had as immediat communion with Idolatry,as *Zepper* or any reaſonable Iudge would require for the caſhiering of it.

As for *Peter Martyr*,howſoever in one epiſtle to *Hooper*,he ſetteth as good a colour upon the reliques of Idolatry as he could, becauſe he thought by a little yeelding of *Hooper* and ſuch men, the ſuperſtitions themſelues might quickly be removed: yet in another Epiſtle,p.1125. he giveth this peremptorie ſentence, *Profecto ſi ex animo ſuperſtitiones odiſſemus, vel ipſa eorum veſtigia omnibus modis curaremus extirpanda*: i. *If wee hated ſuperſtition from the heart, wee would aboliſh all the reliques of it.* To the ſame purpoſe he ſpeaketh p.1127. vvhere he ſheweth that his conſcience would never ſuffer him to weare the Surplice, when he vvas Canon of Chriſt-church in Oxford. If this vvere not his reaſon, hee had ſome other very much akin to this. Neither will the Defendant ſay haſtily, I hope, that either *Peter Martyr*, or *Hooper*, were *diſorderderly exorbitant* men in thoſe times, fit to be diſplaced, that more diſcreet conformiſts might come in their places: as now he pronounceth of thoſe that refuſe to conforme.

SECT. XXX.

WHen all faile, a contradiction muſt be found betwixt our concluſions, and our confeſſions and practiſes, but I aſſure my ſelfe, there is not any reader ſo ſimple, but if hee look over this ſection, will preſently ſee, that he hath not brought one example of *any humane ceremonie, not neceſſarie, notoriouſly known, to haue been abuſed unto Idolatry*, that is allowed by us. Why then ſhould I ſpend ink and paper in labouring to untwine ſuch ropes of ſand? Onely I would ask the Defendant certaine queſtions.

1. If a Temple, a Bell, or a Table-cloth haue ſuch Idolatry put uppon them by the Papiſts, as the croſſe hath?

2 If his own heart do not tell him, that there is a civill uſe of ſuch things, which cannot be imagined of the croſſe?

3 What ſuperſtition there was in the meere ſignifications given by *Durandus* unto Bells, and Bell-ropes, vvhich is not to be found in the Croſſe and Surplice?

4 Whether the Pagan uſe of Bay-leaues vvhich was aboue a thouſand yeares paſt, doth caſt ſuch a reflection upon our civill uſe of bay-leaues, as the Popiſh ſuperſtition doth upon our ceremonies?

5 What ſence he had to find fault with us for not altering the ſituation of Churches?

6 If it be all one to call a ſhip by the name of *Caſtor* and *Pollux*, as *Paul* doth, Act. 28. 11. and to uſe a religious ceremonie in Gods worſhip, vvhich is taken from theſe Idolls?

7 If it be one thing to change copes into cuſhions, and to uſe a Maſſe veſtiment in Gods worſhip?

8 If it be not a kind of ſlander to ſay, that the Church of Geneva impoſeth a round wafer cake, like the Papiſts, to be uſed in the Lords Supper, when as onely unleavened bread is uſed, becauſe cuſtome in that part more prevailed, then the grave advice of *Calvin*, *Farel*, *Viret*, and the other excellent paſtors? And if it bee not a wide leap, to bring in the practiſe of Geneva, for an inſtance of the Non-conformiſts practiſe in England?

By that time theſe queſtions be truely anſwered, the Defendant vvill haue but a ſmall harveſt out of our confeſſions and practiſes.

CHAP. V. SECT. I. ad X.

THE Authours of the Abridgement framed a ſtrong Argument againſt our ceremonies from the rules of ceremonies preſcribed in the Word, p. 43 &c. with this Argument vvhen the Defendant vvas not able to grappell, as it ſtood in the parts combined, he thought good to ſever ſome parcels of it, and try vvhat he could ſay to them apart. Thus out of this one Argument he hath taken that which he calleth our firſt: and out of the ſame he hath made up this fiſt; and yet hee hath quite left out a great part of the ſinewes wherewith that one reaſon is knit together in the Abridgement.

The argument is taken from the ſcandall or offence vvhich the impoſing and uſing of theſe ceremonies do bring unto divers ſorts of men.

The Defendant heere maketh great flouriſhing in nine whole Sections, defining, dividing, and ſubdividing a ſcandall, as if he would make all cleare before him: but at the end of all this preparation, he maketh no application of theſe Rules unto the matter in hand at all: but onely, telleth his Reader, p. 154, *That theſe diviſions aud ſubdiviſions will expedite all difficulties, ſo that out of them he may collect the true and falſe ſenſe of Scriptures alledged.* It vvere ſufficient therefore either to deny this power to be in his diviſions: or elſe to ſet down as many other ſubdiviſions of ſcandall (vvhich vvere eaſie to doe) and then tell him that theſe vvill expedite the controverſie, and that from them hee may collect the errours of his anſwer. But I will notwithſtanding briefly ſhew my opinion concerning ſome of theſe dictates.

The definition vvhich he onely alloweth of as accurate is, that *a ſcandall is a wilfull offence againſt Chriſtians, in provoking of them unto any damnable errour or ſinne, by any ſenſible externall meanes:* Sect. 1. Wherein notwithſtanding many faults may be found. For 1 every ſcandall is not *wilfull*, except the word be taken more largely then uſe of ſpeech will allow. 2 Every ſcandall is not againſt Chriſtians. 3 A ſcandall is not onely by provoking to ſinne, but alſo in hindring from good. 4 what doth he meane to put in the word *damnable*? the occaſioning of any ſin, ſufficeth to make up a ſcandall.

Among his ſubdiviſions, the firſt thing I except againſt is, ſection 5, vvhere he diſtinguiſheth ſo betwixt *perſons and cauſes*, *either determined or undetermined, that in matters determined by the Church* (as he teacheth) *obedience is to be given without reſpect of ſcandall : and onely in matters undetermined there is a charitable conſideration to be had of other mens conſciences.* This is a new and a tickle point of Divinity touching the tendereſt part of our ſpirits, even our conſciences, and other mens alſo. It ought therefore either not to haue been propounded, or elſe to be well confirmed either with teſtimonies, or vvith reaſons drawn out of Scripture. But alas the Def. thruſteth it upon us without any ſuch vvarrant. *The peace of the Church* (ſaith he) *is to be preferred before the grievance* i.e. ſcandall *of any ſort of men.* As if the peace of the Church did not more conſiſt in avoyding of ſcandals, then in obſerving of humane ceremonies! it is not the peace of God which is broken by a charitable care of avoyding offences, but by ruſhing into them.

A ſcandall in the nature of it is ſpirituall murder. Now ſuppoſe a Superiour ſhould command a thing in it ſelfe indifferent, whereupon murder vvere like to follow, as to runne a horſe, or a cart, in a certain way, at a certaine time, when it may be unwitting to the commander, little children were playing in the way, vvould any mans conſcience ſerue him to doe it?

Avoyding of ſcandall is a maine duty of charity. May Superiours at their pleaſure appoint how farre I ſhall ſhew my charity towards my brothers ſoule? Then ſurely an inferiour earthly court may croſſe the determinations of the high Court of heaven.

The ſuperiours haue no power given them for deſtruction, but onely for edification. If therefore they command ſcandalls, they goe beyond their commiſſion: neither are we tyed therein to doe as they bid, but as they ſhould bid.

If determination by ſuperiours vvere ſufficient to take away the ſin of a ſcandall. Then they doe very ill that they doe not (ſo farre as is poſſible) determine all things indifferent, that ſo no danger may be left in giving of offence by the uſe of them. Then the Church of Rome is to be prayſed in that ſhe hath determined of ſo many indifferents; then *Paul* with the other Apoſtles might haue ſpared a great deale of labour in admoniſhing the Churches how they ſhould avoyd offences about ſome indifferent things. A farre ſhorter way had bene either to determine the matter finally, or elſe to haue given order that the Churches ſhould among themſelues determine it at home.

But ſay that the Archbiſhop of Corinth (for now I ſuppoſe ſuch a one) had called his Convocation, and vvith conſent of his Clergie had determined that men might, and for teſtifying of liberty ſhould at a certaine time eat of ſuch and ſuch meats which men formerly doubted of: would not yet the Apoſtle haue given the ſame direction he did? would not good Chriſtians ſtill haue had care of their brothers conſciences? Can the determination of a ſuperiour be a ſufficient plea at the barre of Gods judgement ſeat, for a man that by vertue or force thereof alone, hath done any action that his conſcience telleth him will ſcandalize his brother?

Laſtly, I vvould faine know whether thoſe ſuperiours doe not giue a great ſcandall, vvhich take upon them determinately to impoſe unneceſſary rites vvhich they know many good men will be ſcandalized by?

The ſecond notorious flaw vvhich I finde in the Defendant his ſubdiviſions is ſect. 9, where he granteth that *much indulgence indeed is to be uſed in things indifferent towards weake perſons, whoſe infirmity proceedeth onely from ſimple ignorance: but that onely till ſuch time as the doctrine concerning ſuch things haue been ſufficiently declared: becauſe a ſcandall doth alwaies preſuppoſe a meer weakeneſſe for want of due meanes of knowledge.* For 1 *Paul* had ſufficiently declared that it vvas lawfull for him to take wages, yet he would not, 1 Cor.9, he had given ſufficient reaſons for the lawfulneſſe of eating all kind of meats, yet he abſtayned, and ſo counſelled others, for feare of ſcandall, *Rom.* 14 1 *Cor.* 9. 2 There can be no certaine ſet time for all ſorts of men vvhen they are ſufficiently taught. 3 Who is this Def. that he dare judge ſo many of his fellow ſervants, that in ſuch indifferencies as our ceremonies are held to be, they take offence not upon weakeneſſe, but upon preſumption? 4 What authority haue our Prelats to obtrude unneceſſary ceremonies upon the Church, vvhich muſt be declared before they can be uſed? Is it fit that the people ſhould be troubled with the declararion of mens inventions, vvhen they are hardly brought to heare willingly the maine things of the Goſpell? 5 Is it not more agreeable to the wiſedome of God, *Ex.*21. 33, to fill up the pit, then to ſet one by for to warne the paſſengers they fall not into it? 6 There vvas never yet ſufficient declaration of this doctrine of ceremonies throughout England. In many places there is no preaching at all. Many preach ſo, that they declare nothing almoſt to the people but their own folly. Many are aſhamed, or at leaſt unwilling to declare unto the people mens devices. Many declare them ſo corruptly that the ſcandall thereby is not removed but increaſed. And among thoſe that goe about vvith ſome good mind to declare this kind of doctrine, there is almoſt as great variety of declarations as there is of declarers: while ſome will haue them ſignificant ſome not: ſome ſay they are good and profitable ſitable to edification, and others condemning them as altogether unfit, declare them to be tollerable for avoiding of a greater miſchiefe: Some will haue them onely civill, and others Eccleſiaſticall: ſome excuſe all but the croſſe, and ſome extoll the croſſe aboue all. Are not ſuch declarations (thinke you) likely to informe well the conſciences of poore men who doubt more whom they ſhould take for a good Declarer, then they did at the firſt of the things themſelues?

SECT. X.

AMong the inſtances of ſcandall ariſing from the ceremonies, that vvhich in the Abridgement hath the third place is ſet firſt by the Def. viz, that *the ſuperſtitious Papiſt will be hardened in the liking of his abominable Religion, from which he ſeeth wee borrow our ceremonies, and increaſe in his hope of the full reſtoring of it againe.* To this the Def. anſwereth, that *our rites are not the ceremonies of Papiſts, becauſe they are purged from ſuperſtition.* But 1 that they are not purged from all ſuperſtition hath ſufficiently been declared before. 2 This plea of tranſubſtantiating of ceremonies by the breath of our Convocation is a meere ſhift, contrary not onely to the language of all our Divines, and to that vvhich every mans ſenſes doe tell him, but alſo to the publicke profeſſion of the Church of England, in the preface to our ſervice-book, as it is cited by him p. 127. For there we are told 1 that *an abatement is made of the exceſſe of Popiſh ceremonies:* All therefore are not aboliſhed, but ſome remaine. And vvhich be they, if theſe in queſtion be not? 2 That *ſome of the old ceremonies doe remaine.* What ſenſe can be given of theſe words, if our ceremonies be not the ſame with thoſe vvhich were of old among the Papiſts? if it were meant of old ceremonies not uſed among the Papiſts, then they doe not *remaine,* nor are *retained*, but reſtored. 3 That *none are deviſed anew;* therefore they muſt needs be taken from the Papiſts, or from the Fathers: but of the Fathers ſurplice or kneeling at the communion, no inſtance can be given: and as for the croſſe, the Def. himſelfe will not defend, I thinke, all that uſe vvhich the Fathers put it to. 3 The Papiſts own words doe ſufficiently manifeſt how they are hardened by the impoſition and uſe of our ceremonies. For as it is ſhewed in the Abridgement p. 25, they ſeek to juſtifie their ſuperſtition by this, that *we haue borrowed our ceremonies from them.* And ſome of them thence conclude (as there is ſhewed) that our Governours like vvell of their ſuperſtition. Beſide *Gretſer*, a principall Ieſuit ſaith, that in theſe ceremonies our Miniſters are as *Apes of Popiſh Prieſts*, *Apol. pro Gregor.* 7 *pag.* 8, and in his defence, *tom.* 2 *lib.* 4 *cap.* 16 ſaith, that our Convocation houſe in impoſing theſe Ceremonies, doe *croſſe the judgement of our beſt Divines.* Laſtly, the reſpect of that Popiſh ſuperſtition wherwith our people were then generally infected, was the chiefe, if not the onely cauſe why theſe ceremonies vvere retained by our firſt Reformers. See more of this in M. *Parker, p.* 2 *c.* 6 *ſect.* 10.

SECT. XI.

THE ſecond inſtance is, that *that the prophane will draw many arguments hence to bleſſe himſelfe in his contempt of all Religion.* The Def. asketh, *from whence?* I anſwer, from hence: 1 that Religious rites are invented by men, and appointed to be uſed in Gods worſhip, euen after the ſame manner that Gods Ordinances are, or at leaſt vvere of old: 2 That trifles are urged, to the increaſing of contention: 3 that many place ſuch holines in theſe things vvhich they know to be mens deviſes: 4 that other ceremonies are cryed down, as if they vvere againſt Religion, vvhich yet are every vvay as good as theſe: 4 that religious men are more moleſted for theſe toyes, then they are for their profaneneſſe.

SECT. XII.

THE third inſtance of ſcandall is in vveak brethren, *who will be drawn to yeeld unto the ceremonies againſt their conſciences, or elſe doubtingly: and ſome alſo will grow to diſlike ſome Miniſters for theſe things, and ſo be hindred from profiting by their miniſtery.* To this the Def. anſwereth in many words: but the ſumme of all he ſaith is, that *theſe are not weake brethren, becauſe they haue been diligently catechiſed by Non-conformiſts.* But 1 the Corinthians no doubt vvere diligently catechiſed: and yet there were many weak among them. 2 The Def. I hope taketh order (or elſe he may be aſhamed) that all his Dioceſſe be diligently catechiſed; yet I thinke he will not ſay but there are many vveak ſoules in that circuit: 3 The Catechiſers he ſpeaketh of haue had enough to doe, to teach the people the maine points of Religion: as for inſtructing them concerning the lawfulneſſe of humane ceremonies, they left that to thoſe that impoſe them, or to their ſervants: 4 After long teaching and ſufficient knowledge, there may be ſtill a weakneſſe in regard of ſome things, through many circumſtances required unto ſtrength, beſide bare knowledge. Laſtly, we confeſſe, that (upon ſuppoſition that the Def. his doctrine be ſound in theſe points) we are yet weak in theſe points, as we are alſo in ſome other, wherein our adverſaries are ſo ſtrong, that they can beare many Churches and ſuch like things, upon their ſhoulders, without feeling any burthen of them, which we cannot. See M. *Park. ca.* 6 *ſect.* 18.

SECT. XIII.

THE fourth inſtance is thus ſet down in the Abridgement, pa. 50, *As there is danger in the uſe of theſe ceremonies in all Congregations, ſo eſpecially if they ſhall be brought backe againe unto thoſe, where they haue been long out of uſe. In this caſe Calvin, Brentius, Bucer, Hemingius, Beza, Grinæus & other great Divines eſteeme them wicked and unlawfull.*

To all this the Def. giveth no anſwer: but onely taketh occaſion to make a frothy compariſon betwixt the lawes and power of particular Congregations, and the vvhole Convocation houſe. Which becauſe it neither pertaineth to the preſent purpoſe, nor containeth any thing of moment, I leaue as I found: though it may be eaſily proved, that many particular Congregations can tell better vvhat is fitting for their edification in ſome things, then all our Nationall Convocation. Nay, I dare boldly ſay, there is no Towne of note in all England, but twelue men may be choſen out of, vvhich would finde out Canons more to the edification of all the Congregations in England, then thoſe are, which B. *Bancroft* with his Clergie, concluded.

SECT. XIIII.

A Fiſt inſtance, or rather an inlargement of the former is, *in reſpect of the Miniſters who haue formerly refuſed the ceremonies, for whereas the Miniſter is bound to lead his people forward unto perfection; and to provide by all good meanes, that his miniſtery be not deſpiſed: by this meanes he ſhall draw them back again unto the liking of ſuperſtition; or at leaſt not to diſlike it ſo much as they haue done: and giue them evident occaſion to blame his Miniſtery, and to call in queſtion the truth of all his doctrine.*

Here the Def. commeth upon them vvith open mouth, avouching peremptorily, that *this is a falſe, preſumptuous, irreligious, partiall, and pernicious pretenſe: and all this he will proue.* If he can, vve ſhall the eaſilyer beare theſe great words. But why is it *Falſe?* forſooth, *becauſe moſt of the Non-conformiſts haue once ſubſcribed: the contradicting of which ſubſcription is no leſſe a matter of diſcredit then returning unto conformitie.* What kind of proofe is this? becauſe they were ſubject to another diſcredite, therefore this is no diſcredit. Beſide it doth not appeare, nor is likely that moſt of theſe Miniſters did ever abſolutely ſubſcribe: neither is it likely; becauſe it is well known how eaſie and how ordinary it vvas in Qu. *Elizabeths* dayes, to enter into the Miniſtry without paſſing under that gallowes. If the moſt had, yet how would this proue it a falſe pretence in the reſt? If all had done ſo, yet this vvas no act of their Miniſterie, nor known it may be to their people, and therfore the croſſing of it did not ſo directly tend to the diſcrediting of their Miniſtery, as the croſſing of their publick doctrine. Laſtly, that which is done before a man be ſetled in the Miniſtery at one time, without any great deliberation, is not of ſuch note as that which a man hath long profeſſed & perſwaded by reaſons taken from the word of God. By all this it appeareth, that this firſt accuſation of *falſehood* vvas rather an *adventure* as the Def. himſelfe calleth it, then a grounded aſſertion.

He did but *adventure* neither to call the ſame plea *preſumptuous*. For he can finde no other reaſon to beare up this charge withall then, *that they ſeeme to arrogate to themſelues a prerogatiue proper to the Apoſtles*. How can this be I wonder, ſeeing they follow herein the direction of the Apoſtle himſelfe, Tit. 2 15, *Let no man deſpiſe thee*. What this prerogatiue is, he doth not plainly tels us: but compriſeth it in two places of Scripture, 1 *Cor* 15, *Gal.* 2 18, the firſt vvherof is nothing at all to the purpoſe. For the Apoſtle doth not ſay as the Def. maketh him, *If we be found falſe witneſſes, then is your faith in vaine*: but *if Chriſt be not riſen; then are we falſe Witneſſes, and your faith is vaine*: Which alſo any preacher of the Goſpell may ſay vvithout falſhood or preſumption to his people. The ſecond place, *If I build againe that which I haue deſtroyed, I make my ſelfe a prevaricator*, is applyable to any Miniſter that hath taught the truth againſt Popiſh ſuperſtition. This very doctrine M. *Perkins* gathereth out of the words. *Proculcavimus ſuperſtitionem Papiſticam &c.* I hope the Def. doth not thinke he may build up any ſuperſtition, and not be accounted therefore a *prevaricator*: if he doe; or though he doe not, let him conſider vvhere the *preſumption* lyeth.

But vvhy *irreligious*? becauſe *it is perſiſting in an errour, for the preſervation of their own credit*. But 1 vvho taught the Def. to make that vvhich is in queſtion the ground of an accuſation in diſpute. Firſt, let him proue that it is an *errour*, before he take it ſo for granted, that upon that ground he vvill challenge mens reaſons as irreligious. 2 It is not their credit, but the credit of their Miniſtery vvhich they ſpeake of. 3 Is it ſuch an irreligious thing, to deſire that certaine ceremonies may not bee impoſed upon them, leſt their Miniſtery be by that meanes prejudiced?

Why *partiall?* becauſe *men ſhould rather yeeld to Conformitie for the credit of the Church:* i.e. for the credit of the Convocation houſe. Alas, the credit which a great part of that generation doth ſeek for, is that they may rejoyce in our fleſh. But ſuppoſe they meant ſincerely: vvould the Def. haue men diſcredit and prejudice their Miniſtery, to bring ſome credit unto other mens decrees? Or doth the forbearing of ſome ceremonies bring ſuch diſcredit to the Authorizers of them? ſurely then they are more for the honor of mortall men, then for the honour of God. For Gods honour and worſhip is no vvaies prejudiced by their abſence.

The laſt charge is *pernitious*. And heere many words are uſed to giue countenance unto that one. The maine ground is, *Woe to me if I preach not the Goſpell;* and *Simon loveſt thou mee? then feed my ſheep.* Wherupon he gathereth, that *it is a pernicious thing for a Miniſter to put himſelfe unto ſilence.* But 1 vvhat is this to the queſtion of diſcrediting ones Miniſtrie? 2 Although we were moſt vvorthy to haue theſe remembrances out of Scripture rubbed upon us yet the Prelates are altogether unworthy and unfit to doe it. Let any man conceiue vvith himſelfe B. *Bancroft*, or any other in the end of the Convocation, after all the Canons were concluded, comming forth as Prolocutor, and ſpeaking thus to the Miniſters aſſembled together before him. *Men and brethren, the reverend fathers of this Convocation, as they alwayes meditate on the law of God, and every part of it, both day and night; ſo eſpecially doe they lay to heart thoſe paſſages of holy Writ which properly concerne their office: as Woe unto me if I preach not the Goſpell: and Simon loveſt thou mee? feed my ſheep. Out of theſe conſiderations, being carryed with a fervent zeale both of preaching themſelues in their ſeverall places, and alſo of procuring more faithfull Preachers, and more fruitfull preaching throughout the land, they haue over and aboue the institutions of Chriſt, appointed certaine ceremonies ſtrictly to be obſerved of every Miniſter: ſo that whoſoever ſhall heereafter upon any pretenſe refuſe to obſerue the ſame, they ſhall be eſteemed factious, ſchiſmaticall, diſorderly, exorbitant men, and for that cauſe by their Ordinary ſuſpended and deprived. oNw for the preventing of ſuch a miſchiefe your tender mother would haue you to underſtand by my mouth, that if any man bee thruſt out of the Miniſtery for not yeelding to theſe conſtitutions, howſoever they may ſeeme unto him ſuch as the Church cannot lawfully appoint, nor bee obſerue, yet he is author of his own ſilencing: and therefore you muſt all be exhorted to conſider well of theſe parcels of Scripture which haue ſo much prevailed with your carefull mother. Woe is me if I preach not the Goſpell; Simon loveſt thou mee? feed my ſheepe.*

Would not he that heard ſuch a ſpeech as this from a Prelate be forced to call for for a baſon? and after he had recovered himſelfe he might well giue anſwer in theſe words, *I heare the words of a deceitfull tongue. Behold thou art called a Biſhop, and glorieſt in that title: thou perſwadeſt thy ſelfe, thou art a chiefe guide and father of the Church, thou therefore that teacheſt another, teacheſt thou not thy ſelfe? Thou that ſayeſt it is a woefull thing not to preach the Goſpell, doeſt thou neither preach Chriſt faithfully, nor ſuffer thoſe that would? Dareſt thou by thine owne authoritie, and for thine owne pleaſure, hinder ſo many able men from preaching? thou that profeſſeſt the flocke muſt bee fed, doeſt thou thruſt out feeders, and keep in ſtarvers? Therefore thou art inexcuſable, ô Prelat, whoſoever thou art, that condemneſt another for that whereof thou art both beginning and ending.*

Thirdly, the Apoſtles woe, 1. *Cor.* 9. belongeth to negligent, ſlothfull, and careleſſe miniſters properly, ſuch as our Prelats know where to find enough, vvho yet neither feele nor feare that vvoe from the Biſhops vvhich many faithfull preachers are wrapped in from time to time.

Fourthly, the Apoſtle doth not pronounce any vvoe for not preaching, vvhere impriſonment doth hinder. Now hee vvhoſe conſcience is againſt the ceremonies, or doubteth of them, is ſpiritually impriſoned, ſo that he cannot by vſing of them, make his vvay to the pulpit.

Fiftly, it is a meere jeſt, though a bitter one, to ſay, that we leaue our miniſteries: when we doe all that our conſciences vvill ſuffer us to doe, for the holding of our places: and vvhen we haue done all that, depart againſt our wills with ſorrow. *Non diſcedit a ſtatione, qui cedit invitus.* See Mr. *Parker*, p. 1. c. 4. ſ. 14.

But the Defendant undertaketh to proue, that the cauſe of ſilencing is not in the Biſhops that ſuſpend and deprive us: but in our ſelves. He is as it ſeemeth, a great adventurer: For hee commeth forth upon this peece of ſervice vvith flying colours: *Know you well what you ſay* (ſayth hee) *when you lay the cauſe of your ſilencing upon the Biſhops?* Yes ſurely, very well. For a cauſe is that which bringeth force or vertue to the being of another thing.

Now the firſt vertue (or rather vice) which tendeth to ſilencing of Miniſters in this caſe, is in the Biſhops canons: they therefore are the firſt cauſe. The ſecond vertue is in the Biſhops and their officers, which are executioners of thoſe unconſcionable canons: they therefore are the ſecondarie cauſe. Non-conformitie hath no vertue in it of it own nature, nor by Gods ordinance, to bring forth ſuch an effect as the ſilencing of Gods Miniſters

is:

ls: though it bemade an occaſion by the perverſneſſe of our Prelats. I know well what I ſay: and will make it good againſt the Defendants vain pretences. *The caſe ſtandeth thus* (ſayth he) *Titus* (It had been more proper to ſay Diotrephes) *the Biſhop doth depriue Titius a factious & ſchiſmatical miniſter, that he may place Sempronius, a peaceable and diſcreet man, in his ſtead. In this proceeding, the intendment of Titus is not abſolutely to deprive Titius, as he is a Miniſter, but as he was factious: yet ſo onely reſpectiuely, that Titius being deprived, he may conſtitute Sempronius: for the charge of a Biſhop is not determinate to appoynt preciſely this miniſter: but indefinite, to ordaine a miniſter: ſo that the courſe of Gods plow is ſtill preſerved and continued. But as for Titius, who will rather be ſilenced then conforme, it is evident, that the cauſe of his ſilencing being his own refractarineſſe, which is onely perſonall and proper to himſelfe, and yet hath no facultie in himſelfe to appoynt or admit of a ſucceſſor: he may be ſayd to haue properly cauſed his owne ſuſpenſion and deprivation.*

This caſe needeth no long demurring on: for there is not one ſentence in all the length of it, which doth not ſmell, without any uncaſing. 1. are all thoſe factious and ſchiſmaticall men, that refuſe to conforme? vvas *Hooper* ſuch a kind of man? vvas *Peter Martyr* and Mr. *Perkins* ſuch, vvhen one at Oxford, and the other at Cambridge, refuſed to vveare the Surplice? was Mr. *Goodman*, Mr. *Deering*, Mr. *More*, Mr. *Rogers*, and ſuch like heavenly men, the lights and glory of our Churches, vvere all theſe factious and ſchiſmaticall? In the preſence of God it is well known they were were not. But our prelats haue this prerogatiue, they may dubbe whom they pleaſe factious aud ſchiſmaticall, and after that, there is no redemption, they muſt be ſuch, be they otherwiſe never ſo full of all grace.

2 Are all peaceable diſcreet men, which are placed in the deprived miniſters ſtead? For the beſt of them, they are ſtill as great eye-ſores to our Biſhops almoſt as the other: becauſe they reprove a great deale of Epiſcopall darkneſſe, by their practiſes. For the reſt, the congregations over whom they are ſet, cannot finde it, the voyce of all the countrey is otherwiſe for many of them; yet according to the Prelats meaſure, who meat (as it ſeemeth) the vertues and vices of a miniſter by certaine ceremonies of their owne impoſing, it cannot bee denied, but the moſt of them are very peaceable & diſcreet: Even ſo as many of the Biſhops themſelves were known to be afore they were Biſhops, and ſhew themſelves to be ſtill: for *Epiſcopatus plures accepit quam fecit bonos.*

3 What ſence can this haue, *The Biſhop depriveth Titius reſpectively, that he may conſtitute Sempronius?* Doth hee know before-hand vvhom he ſhall conſtitute? then there is groſſe legerdemaine, betwixt

betwixt

twixt him and that *Sempronius*. For with what conſcience can one ſeeke and the other aſſigne the place of him that is in poſſeſſion? This is but ſome time in thoſe benefices vvhich are fatter, and whoſe patrons are more fooliſh. Ordinarily, the vileſt miniſter that is to be found, may ſucceed in the place of him that is deprived, for ought the Biſhop knoweth, or for ought he can doe, except he will endure a *quare impedit*, which in caſe of morall unworthineſſe, hath ſcarce been ever heard of.

4 The charge which he ſayth our Biſhops haue of appoynting Miniſters, I vvonder from whence they haue it, or by vvhat conveyance. They ſay that they themſelues are the proper paſtors of all the pariſhes in their Dioceſſe. It is well, if they haue an ubiquitary facultie, and vvill, to performe the office of paſtors to ſo great a people: but vvho made them ſuch? Chriſt and his Apoſtles never knew of ordinary paſtors, having charge of ſo many Churches. But ſuppoſe they did, by vvhom doth Chriſt call one of our Biſhops? by the Kings congedelier, the Chapiters nominall election, or by the Arch-biſhops conſecration? There is none of theſe that can beare the triall of ſcripture, nor of the Primitiue Churches example?

6 Is the Biſhops power of appointing a miniſter no wayes determinate to this or that miniſter? then it ſeemeth his meere will determineth of the particular perſon, without any iuſt reaſon. For if there be certain cauſes or reaſons which the Biſhop is bound to follow in deſigning of this or that miniſter, rather then another, then is the Biſhop determinate. The Councel of Nice it ſelfe determined the authoritie even of Patriarches in this caſe: viz. that the Elders ſhould firſt nominate fit men ἐπιλέγεσθαι ὀνόματα τῶν ἀξίων: ſecondly that the people ſhould elect or chooſe out of that number, *per* χειροτονίαν: and thirdly, that the Biſhop ſhould confirme the elected προχειρίζεσθαι, συνεπιψηφίζειν, ἐπισφραγίζειν. Socrat. l. α. p. 177. What exorbitant power is this then vvhich our Biſhops doe now-a-dayes chalenge unto themſelues? All Claſſicall Divines do conſent to that which *Iunius* ſetteth downe, Conc. 5. l. 2. c. 6. n. 73. that no Biſhop can ſend or appoynt a miniſter *ſine certa ac juſta eccleſiæ poſtulatione*, vvithout the certain fore-choyce of the Church: *Id enim eſſet obtrudere non mittere*. For that were to obtrude him, not to ſend him.

6 How is the courſe of Gods plow preſerved, when for the moſt part the ſucceeding miniſter is thruſt vpon the people againſt their wills, and ſo pernitious contentions ariſe, of vvhich the Biſhop is cauſe procreant and conſervant, by depriving the people of their miniſter, and obtruding his own miniſter upon them, and upholding him in al thoſe courſes vvherby he grieveth the poor people.

7 As the Miniſter hath no facultie in himſelfe to appoint a ſucceſſor, ſo hath not the Biſhop neither of himſelfe, and by himſelfe.

Thus much for the defendant his caſe. Whereas he addeth, that *Beza* and Mr. *Cartwright* determined with him in caſe of the Surplice. I anſwer, 1. they did not ſo for the croſſe. 2. they did not ſo for ſubſcription to either. 3. they did not ſo but by way of toleration, requiring alſo that men did ſpeake againſt the impoſing of the Surplice. 4. *Beza* was not throughly acquainted with the ſtate of our Church. Mr. *Cartwright* (as I haue been certainly informed by his owne ſonne) recalled that paſſage of his booke, and deſired that his revoking of it might be made known.

I thought good, overſeeing the Preſſe, to confirme the Authors report, by a more particular relation which I haue receiued from a perſon of good credit, ſet downe in writ as followeth.

MR. *Cartwright being beyond the ſeas, in printing the reſt of his 2. Reply, werein that indulgence is, ſent to the Miniſters of England who ſought reformation with him, for their opinion of the uſe of the Surplice in caſe of deprivation: 22 of whom met therabout, of whom 19 ioyntly agreed that it was ſimply unlawfull in any caſe, but the other three ſayd otherwiſe; wherefore it was agreeed by all, that each part ſhould write their opinion, and their reaſons to him, which they did: but the letter of the nineteene miſcarried, and that of the other three was delivered, which he taking as the letter of the whole, ſuppoſed their joynt conſent had been, that the loſse of the miniſterie altered the caſe of the unlawfulneſs, and ſo that they were all againſt him; whereupon he miſtruſting his owne judgement, and being much perplexed thereabout, ſuffered himſelfe to be ſwaied unto what is there written: but afterward underſtanding the right, hee was much more perplexed; yea (as he ſayd) more then ever he was, in that to the great prejudice of the truth, he had ſuffered his conſcience to be ſo defiled, which was forbidden, 1 Cor. 8. 7. which hee hartily ſorrowed to many, profeſsing that if he againe put pen to paper about that ſubiect, he would cleare the cauſe, and blame himſelfe, praying them to ſignify the ſame freely in the meane time, the which they did, ſo that it ever ſince hath been currant among all his friends, and conſtantly affirmed by them to all on due occaſions, and particularly affirmed to M. Sprint by a Gentleman in the preſence of one Nobleman, two Gentlemen, 27.*

miniſters, and many profeſſors, in his courſe, in the ſcanning his booke then about to be printed divers yeares before it was printed; ſundry alſo of thoſe miniſters avouched the ſame, ſome on their owne knowledge, others vpon undoubted teſtimonie, which yet is ready to be avouched in due caſe of need, and ſhould now be expreſſed, were not the naming of the avouchers dangerous unto them, and ſo not to be done without their knowledge, which now cannot be.

For the poynt it ſelfe, when a man doth but ſtand in doubt betwixt uſing the ceremonies, and ſuffering of deprivation, it muſt needs be more ſafe, patiently to ſuffer himſelfe to bee thruſt from his miniſterie, then to reteine it and offend his conſcience by uſing the ceremonies. For to bee reſtrained by authoritie from his lawfull function, becauſe hee will not yeeld to the doing of that vvhich to him is ſinne, is no more ſinne in the ſufferer, then to ſurceaſe his publicke preaching whileſt he is held in priſon, where he wanteth occaſion. Thus the uſe of that is avoyded, which he diſalloweth, and the blame of leaving his ſtanding, is theirs vvho caſt him from thence, and not his. So no ſin is committed either in the uſe of that hee diſalloweth, or in ſuſteining deprivation. But to hold his place, and to practiſe againſt conſcience, is to commit one great ſin at the leaſt.

Thus having examined the Defend. his adventurous charges of *falſe, preſumptuous, irreligious, partiall, and pernitious*, I finde them all to bee but raſh vvords of diſtemper.

SECT. XV.

IN the laſt place, the Defendant bringeth forth to anſwer the vvords of the Apoſtle, 1. Theſſ. 5. 22. *Abſtaine from all appearance of evill.* But as this argument is not found at all in that page of the Abridgment vvhich he citeth, ſo in the words or ſence vvhich he ſetteth downe, I dare ſay it is not uſed either of them, or any other againſt the ceremonies. Yet let us heare his anſwer. *The Apoſtle ſpeaketh* (ſayth he) *of the opinions of privat men.* But 1. vvhat vvarrant hath he to reſtraine a generall precept, when the vniverſalitie of it agreeth vvith the law? *Abſtain from all appearance,* ſayth the Apoſtle: 1. ſayth the Def. *from ſome privat opinions.* 2. Why muſt appearance of evil be needs underſtood of *opinions onely*? two or three interpreters indeed do underſtand it of doctrine moſt properly: but the moſt otherwiſe; & the word tranſlated *appearauce*, ſignifying rather an obiect of ſeeing then of hearing, leads us rather to the eye, as in actions, geſturs, garments, then to the ear in doctrines.

3. For that vvhich he addeth of *privat* mens opinions, there is no circumſtance of the text, nor any reaſon or authoritie that doth vvarrant ſuch a gloſſe.

SECT. XVII.

AMong his accuſations wherein he chargeth us with manifold ſcandalls, the firſt is, that *ſome weak ones by occaſion of theſe differences, ſtand amazed, and ſo become more remiſſe in profeſſion of religion.* Where 1. it is to bee obſerved, that when wee ſpake of weake-ones ſect. 12. it was put off with this pretence, that they vvere ſuch as we had catechiſed. Now then, vvho are theſe vveak ones? I hope the Biſhops provide that people of their Dioceſſes are well catechiſed: whence then is this weakneſſe. 2. Differences in matters of circumſtance are not wont to breed ſcandal, vntill ſome authoritie injoyne uniformitie, as vve may ſee in the primitiue churches. 3. If differences be the occaſion of this ſcandal, ſurely thoſe that differ from us, may as vvell be accuſed therefore, as we that differ from them, eſpecially vvhen we urge nothing of ours upon them, but they impoſe their owne devices upon us, and ſo are cauſes of the differences. 4. the amazement vvhich ſome haue, vvondring vvhat vvill be the event of differences, is no *damnable error*, which by the Def. is required to a ſcandall, ſect. 1. And if they grow remiſſe in religion upon it, that is their ſinne. I am ſure zeale againſt ſuperſtition, and for pure and undefiled worſhip, hath no fitneſſe in it to vvork remiſſeneſſe in religion: but urging of humane devices in Gods vvorſhip, tendeth directly thither.

SECT. XVIII.

THe ſecond charge of ſcandall, is in reſpect of the *Separatiſts*. Where 1. I aske, if *Gaius* had made a ſeparation from the Church wherein *Diotrephes* lived, vvhether the Apoſtle *Iohn* had been cauſe of that ſcandal, becauſe he condemned his abuſe of excommunication. 3. *Ioh* 9. 10. 2. If any ſeparate from Churches where Images are retained, who is the cauſe, they that diſlike of Images, or they that retaine them? 3. The diſlike of ceremonies is not the cheife cauſe for vvhich ſeparation is made: but the intollerable abuſes vvhich are in Eccleſiaſticall Courts: by which it commeth to paſſe, that many poore men being troubled at the firſt for a ſmall thing, afterward are driven to flye the countrey: and flying with a hatred of ſuch courſes, are ready to receiue that impreſſion which is moſt oppoſite unto them. The thing it ſelfe is plaine enough to all indifferent men, that Eccleſiaſticall corruptions urged and obtruded, are the proper occaſion of ſeparation.

SECT. XIX. XX.

IN the next place the Papiſts are alledged as perſons offended by Non-conformitie, becauſe *they are utterly unperſwadeable to enter into a Church where all ancient rites are profeſſedly rejected.* But 1. the refuſing of conformitie by the Miniſters, doe not, I hope, make theſe ancient rites (much leſſe all) to be profeſſedly reiected by our Church. For then we may plead the profeſſion of our mother as well as the Defendant: which he I am ſure will not grant. 2. This aſſertion which is given as a reaſon, is evidently falſe. For in Scotland, France, the Low-countries, and ſuch like Churches, vvhere none of theſe ceremonies are retained, the power of Gods word (vvhich doth not depend on human ceremonies) is as effectuall to the converſion of Papiſts, as in England. 3. How doth this agree vvith that vvhich the Defendant hath ſo often told us, that *our ceremonies are not the ſame with the Papiſts ceremonies:* and that *the Papiſts haue no great conceit of our ceremonies,* cap. 2. ſect. 11. 4. If our contentions about theſe things bee a ſcandall to the Papiſt, let them looke to it that caſt theſe apples of contention into the Church, under the pretenſe of peace and uniformitie. 5. One miniſter without conformitie, as old Mr. *Midſly* of Ratſdell, vvho vvas after ſilenced for his labour, hath converted more Papiſts then any (I might ſay then all) of the Biſhops in England, vvith all his ceremoniall obſervations. 6. It is vvell knowne that there are farre more Papiſts and Popiſhly affected in thoſe places vvhere ceremonies are moſt obſerved, then where they haue been diſuſed. 7. It is anſwered in the Abridgement, pag. 47. 48. that ceremonies are not for the edification of the Papiſts, but for the hardening of them. And that Papiſts are not ſo much to be reſpected as brethren. To the latter of vvhich words, the Defendant replieth vvith a deſcant upon the tearme Brethren, ſect. 20. but ſayth nothing at all to the purpoſe. 8. What manner of converts they are uſually who are addicted to humane ceremonies, vve may ſee in the Archbiſhop of Spalato, and ſuch others.

SECT. XXI.

THe greateſt ſcandall of all (ſayth the Defend.) is againſt the Church. Now this Non conformiſts are made guiltie of two vvayes: 1. comparatiuely in this ſection, and then abſolutely in the next. The comparatiue accuſation is, *that we for avoyding of offence towards our brethren, grievouſly offend our mother, in that wherin*

Wee owe obedience unto her. Where 1. the queſtion is taken for granted, for we deny that we owe obedience in the ceremonies to any man or ſocietie of men. 2. If our mother be ſomewhat angry, that is not preſently a ſcandall by his definition, ſect. 1. but vvhen ſhee is provoked to a mortall errour. Now what *mortall errour* doe vve provoke the Church to? Our deſire and ſcope is, that the ceremonies ſhould be either wholly removed, or elſe left free to uſe or diſuſe: this is no mortall errour, I hope. The event by accident is the ſilencing, depriving, excluding, and moleſting of us for Non conformitie: This indeed is a great errour and ſinne of the Prelates; but as vvas formerly ſhewed, the beginning of it is in their irregular Canons, and the ending of it, in their cruell executions. 3. by applying our ſelues to the will of the Prelates in theſe ceremonies, vvee ſhould, though not anger, yet greatly ſcandalize them, by confirming them in a ſinne of making their owne will a rule to the Churches, even in myſticall ceremonies of ſuperſtitious worſhip, contrary to their and our daily prayer, *Thy will be done*. 4. The convocation doth not carry herſelfe like a mother toward us: neither doe we acknowledge any ſuch honour to belong unto it. As for the faithfull congregatious of England, the greatteſt part of them would willingly be rid of theſe burthens.

The reſt of this Section is nothing pertinent: yet two things may bee noted in it. 1. *An errour that the number of the Iewiſh Proſelites was great, and the converted Gentiles few, Acts* 15. 2 *A groſſe aſſertion, that after the doctrine of Indifferencie in eating of meats, was made publicke by the Church, then to haue ſought by abſtaining to avoyd the offence of ſome, had been to the preiudice of Chriſtian libertie, and to the ſcandall of the Church.*

The other accuſation of *contempt* is onely objected ſect. 22. and varniſhed over with a few gloſing words ſect. 23. and therefore may well bee anſwered vvith contempt. But hee that will ſee a full refutation of this, let him read Mr. *Parker* chap. 5. ſect. 11. 12. I am wearie of wraſtling with the winde: yet one unworthy and unchriſtian taunt I cannot paſſe by, that hee upbraideth the Miniſters with, liuing upon voluntary contribution, and feare of offending their maintainers. For 1. when as he confeſſeth, he hath no windowes to look into mens conſciences by, what rule of religion will permit him to caſt upon his brethren ſuch a ſuſpition contrary to their profeſſion, of practiſing and ſpeaking againſt their conſciences for gaining of a poore contribution? Is there not farre more cauſe to thinke, that great livings, and worldly honours (one of the choiceſt darts that ſatan hath in his quiver, & therefore therfore tried againſt our Saviour himſelf when al other faild, *Mat* 4 8 9) is it not more likely I ſay that theſe promotions beare more ſway in the mindes of our great Prelates, then a poore ſupply of neceſſaries vvith others? 2 Neither all, nor the moſt part of them againſt whom he writeth did liue upon contributions. Though they need not haue been aſhamed thereof if they had: ſeeing not onely the primitiue Paſtors did ſo, but even in our time, M. *Perkins* and other ſuch lights of our Church, haue vvith that kinde of life done more good then all our Cathedrall men vvith their great revenues. 3 Who are the cauſe that many are forced to liue upon contribution? haue not the Loiterers of Cathedrall Churches ingroſſed a great part of that maintenance vvhereby labouring Preachers ſhould be maintained? Doe not our Pluraliſts and Non-reſidents cary away the fat of the greateſt livings, and leaue ſcarce a Serving-mans wages to their Curats; ſo that either they muſt be ſupplyed by contribution, or elſe by begging? Nay, doe not the people in divers places take it for a great courteſie at the Non-reſidents hands, if he vvill take his Tithes, and ſuffer them to procure and maintaine to themſelues an honeſt Miniſter in his place? haue not our Honourable Parliament offered to provide ſome competent maintenance for the Miniſters, if the Clergie would forbeare their ſinfull exceſſes? 4 Why ſhould the Miniſters depend ſo much upon contribution, if they had ſuch accommodatiue conſciences, as this Def. ſurmiſeth of them? Some of them with ſerving the time, and the addition of Simony, might come to be Biſhops: & the reſt might be preferred by their meanes to ſome certaine in-comings.

CHAP. VI. SECT. III.

NOW vve are come to the ſixt and laſt generall Argument, viz. that *the impoſition of theſe ceremonies is oppoſite unto Chriſtian liberty*. Here the Def. obſerveth firſt, that *the ſtate of this queſtion is about liberty from the neceſſary obſervation of ſuch things as are in their own nature indifferent. This* (ſaith he) *the Objector implyeth.* But I anſwer, the Objector doth not imply it: he ſpeaketh of ceremonies lawfully appointed by man, that theſe are to be uſed as things indifferent. Neither if one private Obj. had granted it, ought it therefore to be ſet down as the received ſtate of the queſtion, ſeeing the Abridgment, which in this defence is chiefly oppoſed, doth every where deny the cerem. to be in their own nature indifferent. But let that paſſe & examine his reſolution. *Ther be two kinds of neceſſities incident unto humane* *precepts and ordinances, in the caſe of indifferencie: one is neceſſitie of obedience to the commandement, which cannot properly prejudice Chriſtian liberty: the other is doctrinall neceſſity; when any of thoſe properties which are eſſentiall unto divine Ordinances are attributed unto a humane conſtitution: as 1 immediately to binde the conſcience: 2 to be a neceſſary meanes to ſalvation: 3 to hold it altogether unalterable by the authority of man: this is a preſumption and prevarication, not onely againſt Chriſtian liberty, but alſo againſt the ſoveraigntie of God himſelfe.* But 1 vvhat meaneth this new diſtinction betwixt *neceſſitie doctrinall and obediential? doctrinal* before p. 3 was oppoſed unto *ceremoniall:* now unto *obedientiall;* both without a logick, or ſound reaſon. 2 He ſhould haue told us vvhat kind of *neceſſitie obedientiall* he meaneth: for *Bell. de pont. rom. l. 4 c. 17*, uſeth the ſame pretence of *obedience*, and alledgeth the ſame places of Scripture for it: and yet is confuted by *Iunius, Whitakers* and our Divines. 3 If there be doctrinall neceſſitie, in all thoſe humane conſtitutions, which haue properties attributed unto them eſſentiall unto divine ordinances, then our ceremonies in controverſie not onely haue ſuch a myſticall ſignification attributed unto them as is proper unto divine Ordinances; but alſo that they are impoſed as parts of Gods vvorſhip. 4 For the three properties, which the Def. mentioneth, they are ſuch as Papiſts in impoſing of their ceremonies (vvhich yet by the judgement of all our Divines depriue men of Chriſtian liberty) doe diſclaime. As for *immediate binding of mens conſciences*, no learned Papiſt uſeth ſuch a phraſe. *Azorius* a Ieſuit *inſtit. mor. parte* 1, *lib. 5 cap. 6*, ſaith expreſly that humane lawes doe not bind, *directe, proxime, & per ſe; directly, immediately, and of themſelues. Bellarmine* alſo, *de Rom. pont. l. 4, cap. 20 ad arg. 9*, ſaith as much; *leges humanæ non obligant ſub pœna mortis, niſi quatenus violatione legis humanæ offenditur Deus. i. e: they doe not immediately binde mens conſciences.* For *neceſſity to ſalvation*, the ſame, *Bellarmine de verb. non ſcript. c.* 11 ſaith plainly, *That thoſe things which are ſimply neceſſary unto ſalvation are ſet down in Scripture; and that the reſt are not ſimply neceſſary.* And it is plaine enough that they doe not hold them *altogether unalterable* by that authority vvhich brought them in: for beſide, that no reaſonable man can deny ſo manifeſt a truth, they haue altered many ancient Rites, as all the learned know. So that the Defendant his diſtinction is proved nothing elſe but a confuſion, common to him vvith the Papiſts, to our ceremonies and theirs.

SECT. IIII. V.

IN the 4 Section, the Def. objecteth to himſelfe under the name of the Abridgement, the words of the Apoſtle, 1 Cor. 7.35, *This I ſpeake to your profite, not that I might caſt a ſnare upon you, ſhewing that the impoſition of neceſſity upon things indifferent, is a very ſnare of mens conſciences.* Now though theſe vvords are not in the Abridgement, yet becauſe as D. *Whitakers* ſaith, *de pont. de pont. c. 4 qu. 7, aureus hic locus eſt, noſtræ libertatis vindex; this is a golden charter of liberty*, therefore it is worthy of due conſideration. The ſumme of the Def. his anſwer is, *that to impoſe a neceſſity where God hath left a liberty, is indeed a ſnare: but this neceſſitie is not taught in our Church.* I anſwer, it is taught in our Church (now a daies) that Eccleſiaſticall canons doe binde mens conſciences. It is taught in our Church that mans will is a ſufficient reaſon for theſe canons about ceremonies. It is taught in our Church, that Sacraments may not be adminiſtred, or God publickly ſerved vvithout theſe ceremonies: that Miniſters called and allowed of God, for theſe ceremonies muſt be ſilenced; that they are to be excommunicated *ipſo facto*, and accurſed which oppoſe themſelues unto them. It is taught alſo, that though a man doubteth in his conſcience of the lawfulneſſe of them, though evident ſcandall vvill follow upon the uſing of them, yet they may not be omitted. If this be not neceſſity enough to inſnare a mans conſcience, I know not vvhat then is.

In the fift Section two places are objected out of the Abridgement, *viz. Gal.* 5 1, *Col.* 2 20, and one of them after a faſhion anſwered. The firſt anſwer is, that the Apoſtle there ſpeaketh *onely of Iewiſh rites*, vvhich is *Bellarmines* anſwer juſt, *de eff. ſacr. c.* 32 *loquitur Paulus de ſervitute judaica, qua ſervierant illi ſub antiqua lege.* The ſecond anſwer is, that the Apoſtles meaning vvas of ſuch an obſervation of theſe ceremonies as had *an opinion of neceſſity, overthrowing the new Teſtament, and eſtabliſhing the old.* So *Bellarmin. ibid. illi cum circumcidi vellent, excidebant à gratia Chriſti, & ſimul obligabant ſe ad omnem legem ſervandam; quod erat prorſus redire ad ſtatum veteris teſtamenti.* We on the other ſide vvith *Danens* againſt that place of *Bell.* ſay *generale eſt Pauli dictum & preceptum;* the words are generall, belonging to all parts of Chriſtian liberty, though principally there applyed to one.

Now the ſervitude from vvhich Chriſt hath made us free is not onely in thoſe things vvhich the Def. ſpeaketh of, but alſo as *Iun. cont.* 3 *l.* 4 *c.* 17 *n.* 19 & 21, ſheweth in ſubjection of our conſciences unto elements of mans appointing, *Gal.* 4 10, and unto the will of men, 1 *Cor.*7 23, vvhich place *Beza* vvell noteth, *is to be underſtood of ſuperſtitions which ſome doe fooliſhly call indifferent things.* It is not onely therfore a freedome from Iewiſh ceremonies, but alſo and even therfore as D. *Whitakers* gathereth from all humane ceremonies that binde or preſſe our conſciences, *Whit. de rom. pont. q.*7 *c.* 3 *ad* 5. But it is in vaine for me to alledge our Divines in this queſtion: the Abridgement alledgeth diverſe, whom the Def. would not vouchſafe an anſwer.

One thing heere the Def. noteth, that in the Abridgement *myſticall* and *carnall* are unſoundly confounded. But I ſay this is unſoundly collected: for theſe two are joyned together there only in reſpect of Iewiſh worſhip, and that vvhich imitateth it: And therefore it is to no end to inſtance in the Sacraments inſtituted by Chriſt, of cleere ſignification, and accompanied with the promiſe and liuely vvorking of the Spirit. The ſame poore inſtance hath *Bellarmine de cult.l.*3 *c.*7 for ſignificant ceremonies.

But *it ſavoureth of the fleſh* (ſaith the Def.) *to call our ceremonies carnall.* Why ſo I pray? *the Iewiſh ceremonies deſerved that name,* you your ſelfe ſay, even vvhen they were in force: and ſurely ours deviſed by man, abuſed by idolaters, without neceſſary uſe, deſtitute of all promiſe and ſpirit, are farre more vvorthy to be called carnall, then Gods own Ordinances. Thoſe vvere onely carnall becauſe in compariſon they vvere externall, heavie, dull things: but ours are more heavie and dull, and beſide they are ſinfully carnall, as hath been proved.

But vvhat ſoundneſſe doth this ſavour of, that the Def. ſaith generally of the Iewiſh ceremonies, *they ſignified firſt and primarily outward and carnall promiſes, ſhadowing heavenly things onely under a ſecond veile?* I vvill not exagitat this aſſertion, becauſe it is in the by.

SECT. VI.

HEere an objection is fained out of the Abridgement p. 34, I ſay fained, becauſe there is none ſuch found in the place quoted. That vvhich is there ſpoken concerning other Popiſh ceremonies, is a ſixt proofe of the ſecond Argument, diſtinct from the fift, vvherto that of Chriſtian liberty doth belong. That alſo is handled by the Def. c.3 ſ.7, and there maintained againſt him. So that this might well be omitted. Yet becauſe there is ſome force in the conſequence, let us heare his Defence. The objection which he frameth is this: *If theſe ceremonies do not take away our Chriſtian liberty, and inſnare the conſciences of men, by their impoſition; how ſhall not the Popiſh ceremonies be excuſable, and free from accuſation in this behalfe?* His anſwer is, that *Popiſh ceremonies doe infringe Chri-*

ſtian liberty both in regard of their nature, and alſo in regard of their number. And of both theſe M. Calvin giveth witneſſe. I anſwer 1 for the *nature*, it hath been ſhewed before, that a multitude of Popiſh ceremonies haue no other nature and neceſſity allowed unto them by the learned Papiſts, then ours haue by the Defendant himſelfe. See for this *Bellarmine de effect. ſacr. c.* 30. That which M. *Calvin* ſaith of this point is true notwithſtanding in regard of the conceit which is commonly among the ſimple Papiſts, foſtered by unlearned Monkes, Friers, and other Prieſts, for filthy lucre ſake. 2 The compariſons which M. *Calvin* uſe, viz. *That it is held among the Papiſts a greater wickedneſſe to omit auricular Confeſſion, then to liue impiouſly; eat fleſh on faſting daies, then to liue in fornication; to worke on Saints holy-dayes, then to act miſchiefe, &c.* Theſe he gathereth principally from that practiſe of the Papiſts, whereby they puniſh more ſeverely the breach of their ceremonies then of Gods law. Now this is not onely practiſed by our Prelates, but alſo maintained by this Defendant, chap. 2 ſect. 12, vvith ſuch faire pretence, as the Papiſts may well uſe for the defenſe of their practiſe. 3 As for the multitude of ceremonies among the Papiſts, that maketh their bondage greater thē ours; but doth it make ours none at all? Beſides, when a few myſticall humane ceremonies are admitted, the gate is let open for a multitude: even untill the Convocation will ſay there be too many. For *Bellarmine* himſelfe will grant that ceremonies are not to be multiplyed over much. *Fatemur ceremonias non eſſe nimis multiplicandas de eff. ſacr. c.* 30, but what is too much, that muſt be left to the judgement of the Church or Convocation, ſaith he, and the Defendant both.

SECT. VII. VIII. IX. X.

IN all theſe Sections, the Def. goeth about to teach us the doctrine vvhich concerneth *binding of mens conſciences.* In the firſt his concluſion is good and ſound, *God therfore and not man doth properly and directly binde the conſcience of man.* It is ſufficient therefore to note that it is an improper phraſe to ſay that mens lawes doe binde mens conſciences, in reſpect that God commandeth to obey the juſt lawes of men: for ſo, as *Gerſon* obſerveth, the Phiſitions præſcripts ſhould alſo binde a ſick mans conſcience, in reſpect of Gods vvill, whereby a ſick man is tied to follow the good and wholeſome counſell of his Phyſition.

In the 8 Section two of our Divines are brought in to proue that men are bound in conſcience to obſerue the juſt lawes of Magiſtrates, which none of us ever doubted of.

The 9 Section is ſpent in proving, that *Eccleſiaſticall lawes haue as great force in reſpect of conſcience as politicke.* Which if it bee granted, yet nothing can from thence be concluded for the advantage of ceremonies unlawfully impoſed. But 1 it is diligently to be obſerved, that the Church hath no commiſſion for to make any lawes properly ſo called: as I haue formerly ſhewed in cap. 1 ſect. 16. 2 the common received opinion of all our Divines is contrary to that which the Defendant heere ſaith: as may be ſeene in *Bellarmine de Pont. Rom. l* 4 *c.* 15, and *Iunius*, *Whitakers*, with the reſt, who vvriting againſt *Bellarmine* doe not denie but defend that which he ſaith, *Lutherani & Calviniſtæ omnes docent.* 3 The interrogatories vvhich the Defendant miniſtreth unto us in this caſe doth not proue his Aſſertion. For the Church is a *Society*, but not compleat, if it be conſidered as not comprehending Chriſt the Head and onely Law maker of it. *Breach of peace* is not a ſinne againſt an Eccleſiaſticall, but a divine law. Obedience is to be yeelded unto lawfull Eccleſiaſticall Governours, vvhen they bring the charge of Chriſt vvhoſe Miniſters they are. See D. *Whitakers de pont. Rom. cont.* 4 *q.* 7 *c.* 2 *ad* 12. *The Kings ſtamp*, but vvith an act of Parliament maketh a law in England. As for Apoſtolicall conſtitutions (to vvhich our canons are as like as Apples are to Oiſters) the ſame anſwer which Doctor *Whitakers*, *contra* 4 *q.* 7 *c.* 2 *ad* 5, vvith other of our Divines giveth to *Bellarmine*, may ſerue for our Defendant.

In the 10 ſect. he ſetteth downe nothing but that vvhich he knoweth we all grant.

SECT. XI.

AGainſt the Accuſation of contempt, there vvas (as it ſeemeth) alledged by M. *Nic.* that by the ſame reaſon that Non-conformitie is contempt; bowling, diſuſing of capps, and ſuch habites preſcribed ſhould be contempt. Heere the Defendant firſt bringeth divers interpretations out of the Caſualiſts: and then taketh one for granted vvithout rendring of any reaſon, that he may by it excuſe bowling and diſuſe of cappes. But vvhat if vvee take hold of another interpretation, eſteeming the obligation by the intent of the Law-makers, vvhich vvas againſt Popiſh Recuſancie of our Communion-booke, and not againſt refuſall of ſome few ceremonies contained therein? I ſpeake now of the Statute Law, not of lawleſſe canons. Or what if wee ſhould ſtand upon that interpretation, vvhich fetcheth the obligation from the vveight of the matter impoſed, vvhich in our ceremonies is very little ? Some of theſe I am ſure the Biſhops muſt flye, if they vvill defend their diſuſe of the *Croſier ſtaffe*, vvhich they are bound by our Lawes as vvell to uſe, as the Miniſters are ſurpluſſes.

But all this is needleſſe, becauſe there can be no contempt in a conſcionable forbearance of unlawfull impoſitions ; ſuch as the ceremonies are ſufficiently proved to be.

SECT. XII.

HEere certaine Divines are brought in witneſſing, 1 *that ſuperſtitious opinions doe depriue men of Chriſtian liberty* : vvhich we deny not, but take their teſtimonies as making againſt our ceremonies: becauſe as I haue formerly ſhewed ſome of theſe ſuperſtitious opinions are inſeparable from the impoſing and uſing of them. 2 *That Chriſtian liberty doth not conſiſt in the uſe or diſuſe of things indifferent* : vvhich we alſo vvillingly grant. But I would haue the Defendant remember, that all freedome is not in the minde and conſcience. For vvhere the minde is free, the body may be bound; elſe Chriſtians ſhould not taſte ſo much of this vvorlds miſery as they doe. Now Chriſt hath left unto us not onely an inward liberty of minde and conſcience, but alſo an outward freedom of our bodies and outward man, from ſuch bodily rites in his worſhip as haue not his ſtampe upon them, and his Spirit and bleſſing promiſed unto them. Of this the Defendant ſaith nothing at all.

SECT. XIII. XIIII.

COncerning the profeſſion of our Church ſo often brought in, enough hath been ſaid before, now it ſufficeth to anſwer, that no profeſſion whatſoever can make humane ſignificant ceremonies in Gods worſhip agree with Chriſtian liberty.

As for ſuperſtition, vvhich the Defendant doth now the ſecond time moſt ridiculouſly object, I haue anſwered in the beginning of this Confutation. Now onely I note: 1 how looſely he deſcribeth that ſuperſtition vvhich he calleth *affirmative*: as if no man could uſe any thing ſuperſtitiouſly, except he did hold that *without it the faith of Chriſtianity*, *or the true worſhip of God could not poſſible conſiſt*. Never was there ſuch a deſcription given by any man that conſidered what he ſaid.

2 Hovv manfully he concludeth our negatiue ſuperſtition, upon this ground, that Chriſt hath left theſe ceremonies free,

which is the maine queſtion betwixt him and us.

3 How he miſ-reporteth our opinion, in ſaying abſolutely that wee hold a Surplice to haue unholineſſe and pollution in it: whereas we hold that it is onely made more unfit for Gods ſervice then it was before through idolatrous abuſe: but yet unto other uſes it may be applyed.

4 That in ſtead of Scripture, he bringeth forth the univerſall practiſe of men in the Church: vvhich yet hath been formerly ly alſo refuted.

5 That he can finde no Divine that calleth oppoſing of ceremonies *ſuperſtition*, but onely M. *Calvin* in one place ſpeaking rhetorically, as he uſeth to doe, and not intending any definition or diſtribution of that vice.

6 How he corrupteth *P. Martyrs* words, to haue ſome colour for a new accuſation. *P. Martyr* taking there upon him the perſon of an adverſarie unto *Hoopers* opinion (with whom notwithſtanding afterward he conſented, and recalled the counſell which then he gaue, as appeareth p. 1125) ſaith that if we ſhould refuſe all things that the Papiſts uſed, vve ſhould bring the Church into ſervitude: which aſſertion is moſt true, becauſe the Papiſts abuſed many neceſſarie things, even Chriſts own Ordinances, the obſerving of which is liberty. Now the Def. would haue that preciſely underſtood, and that in the rigour of every word concerning the Surplice.

I haue here ſubioyned apart an Epiſtle of Zanchius *who otherwaies was ſomewhat favourable to Biſhops: wherein the Reader may ſee his iudgement concerning ſuperſtitious garments.*

To the moſt renowmed Queene *Elizabeth*, Defendreſſe of the Chriſtian Religion, and moſt mighty Queen of England, France and Ireland *H. Zanchius* ſendeth greeting.

MOST *gracious and moſt Chriſtian Queene, We haue not without great griefe underſtood, that the fire of contention about certaine garments, which we thought had been quenched long agone, is now againe to the incredible offence of the godly, as it were raiſed from hell, and kindled a freſh* in your Maieſties Kingdome: and that the occaſion of this fire is, becauſe your moſt gracious maieſtie being perſwaded by ſome, otherwiſe great men, and carried with a zeal (but certainly not according to knowledge) to retaine unitie in religion, hath now more then ever before reſolved and decreed, yea doth will and command that all Biſhops † and Miniſters of the Churches ſhal in divine ſervice put on the white and linnen garments which the Popiſh Prieſts uſe now in Poperie; yea that it is to be feared, leaſt this fire be ſo kindled, and caſt its flame ſo farre and wide, that all the Churches of that moſt large and mightie kingdome, to the perpetuall diſgrace of your moſt renowned Maieſtie, be ſet on a flaming fire: ſeeing the moſt part of the Biſhops, men greatly renowned for all kinde of learning and godlines, had rather leaue their office and place in the Church, then againſt their owne conſcience, admit of ſuch garments, or at the leaſt ſignes of Idolatrie and Popiſh ſuperſtition, and ſo defile themſelues with them, and giue offence to the weak by their example. Now what other thing will this be, then by retaining of theſe garments, to deſtroy the whole body of the Church? For without doubt that is Satans intent, by caſting a ſeed of diſſentions amongſt the Biſhops. And that hee aimed at in the infancie of the Church, by ſtirring up diſcord between the Eaſt and Weſt Churches, about the Paſſover and other ceremonies of that kind. Therfore Ireneus Biſhop of Lions, had juſt cauſe in his Epiſtle ſent out of France to Rome, ſharply to reproue Uictor the Pope of Rome, becauſe he out of a kind of zeale, but not according to knowledge, was minded to excommunicate all the churches of Aſia, becauſe they celebrated not the Paſover juſt at the ſame time, as they at Rome did. For this was nothing but by an unſeaſonable deſire to retaine the ſame ceremonies in all churches to rent and teare a peeces the unitie of the Churches. I therefore ſo ſoone as I heard that ſo great a ruine hanged over the Church of Chriſt in that kingdome, preſently, in reſpect of that dutie which I owe to the Church of Chriſt, to your gracious Maieſtie, and to that whole kingdom, intended to write thither, and to try by my uttermoſt endevor whether ſo great a miſchiefe might poſſibly be withſtood: ſome that fear Chriſt, and wiſh wel to your Maieſtie, exhorting me to the performance of this dutie. But when I had ſcarcely begun to think of this courſe, behold our moſt illuſtrious Prince commanded me to do it, which command of his did not onely ſpurre me one, who of mine owe accord was

† Zanchius it is like was miſinformed, for Biſhops haue bin the chief deviſers and adviſers.

alreadie running, but laid a neceſsitie of writing upon me. Wherefore this my boldneſſe will ſeeme the leſſe ſtrange unto your gracious Maieſtie, ſeeing my writing proceedeth not ſo much from mine owne will and counſell of friends, as from the commandement of my moſt Noble Prince, who is one of your gracious Maieſties ſpeciall friends. Now I thought I ſhould doe a matter verie worth the paines taking, if firſt I ſhould humbly admoniſh your moſt famous Maieſtie what your dutie is in this cauſe: and ſecondlie, if as your humble ſuppliant I ſhould beſeech you for our Lord Ieſus Chriſts ſake, to performe the ſame. I beſeech your gracious Maieſtie to take this my writing in good part, for it proceedeth from a Chriſtian loue toward the Church, and from an eſpeciall reverend reſpect that I beare to your moſt gracious Maieſtie. The Lord knoweth all things. Now to the matter in hand.

Whereas the Apoſtle writing to Timothie, commandeth that praiers be made for Kings, and all other that be in authoritie, and ſaith, that the end wherefore they bee ordained, is, that wee may lead a peaceable and quiet life in all (that is, perfect) godlineſſe and honeſtie, he teacheth plainlie enough what is the dutie of godlie Kings and Princes, namelie, that they take care, and bring to paſſe, that firſt and aboue all things, true religion, and the true worſhip of God, where it is baniſhed, bee reſtored, and being reſtored, bee kept pure: all things which ſmell of impietie being farre remoued. Secondlie, that men may liue honeſtlie and holilie, all kinds of vncleanneſſes beeing abandoned. Laſtlie, that publicke peace and holie friendſhip bee maintained among the ſubiects, all occaſions of contentions being, as much as poſſiblie may be, taken out of the way.

As the Apoſtle teacheth manifeſtlie, as we haue ſeene, ſo all learned men who bee of ſound judgement concerning the Magiſtrates office, doe with one conſent affirme, that theſe bee the three chiefe parts of the office of the Prince, and of everie godlie Magiſtrate. Which thing being ſo, I ſee not how your gracious Maieſtie can, with good conſcience, propound againe the garments in queſtion, and other things of that kinde, ſmelling as yet of Popiſh ſuperſtition, and once baniſhed out of the Churches, to the conſciences of the Biſhops * *to be taken on againe, and ſo propound them that you ſhould compell them*

* Pauls Biſhops hee meaneth, or els as I ſayd before, he is miſinformed.

by your commandement to receiue them againe. For firſt, this is quite contrarie to the firſt and chiefe part of the Princes office. For if the Magiſtrate ought to haue a chiefe care, that the worſhip of God be kept pure and without mixture; and if for this cauſe all things are to bee abandoned which may anie way either by themſelues, or by accident defile this worſhip: and therefore all things are to bee called backe as much as may be, to the rule of God, and to the former and Apoſtolicall, and ſo the more pure and ſimple forme of religion: Finallie, if as the Apoſtle commandeth, we bee to abſtaine, not onelie from all evill, but alſo from all appearance of evill; to what end, I beſeech you moſt renowned and moſt godlie Queen, ſhould thoſe things bee brought againe into the Church of God, by the Princes commandement, which be contrarie to the puritie of the Apoſtolicall worſhip, which ſmell of Popiſh ſuperſtition, which bee neither availeable to the edification of the godlie, nor to order, nor for ornament, except that which is whooriſh: which laſtlie, can bring no profit, but on the contrarie, manie evills to the Church? It is out of all doubt, that by this law concerning apparrell, all godlie men will bee offended, but the wicked will laugh in their ſleeve, and hereby be put in hope to get manie moe things: as for thoſe of the middle ſort, that is, ſuch as bee newlie converted and turned from ungodlines to godlines, and be not as yet well grounded, they will be in great danger, and if we ſpeake according to mans judgement, they will rather looke back to the old ſuperſtition, to which by nature wee are inclined, then fixe and faſten their eyes upon true religion. And therefore this is a a decree which will bring no advancement at all to godlines, but may much further vngodlineſſe. For though theſe garments bee not evill and vncleane of and by themſelves, that is, of their owne nature, yet becauſe of the former and late abuſe, they are not altogether free from uncleanneſſe. Certainlie it cannot bee denied, but that they will at the leaſt, giue occaſions of manie evills and verie grievous ſuperſtitions. Now the verie occaſions alſo of evills are to bee ſhunned. To what end then ſhould theſe bee thruſt upon the Church, from whom no profit can bee hoped, verie much evill may come? for this is to tempt God. Your famous Maieſtie may well remember, that not without cauſe it was written, Hee that toucheth pitch, ſhall bee defiled with it:

that the Apoſtle had reaſon to command, that we ſhould purge out the old leaven, that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lumpe. And that Hoſea did not fooliſhly reprove the Iewes, becauſe they tranſlated and brought a yong graffe (of ſuperſtitions) out of Iſrael into their owne garden, that is, the true Church. We ought, moſt religious Queene, to haue nothing at all to doe with the Papiſts in matter of religion, ſaue in thoſe things which they haue common with the Apoſtles. Why, I beſeech you, were ſome kings, otherwiſe godly, reproved and blamed in the Scriptures, that they had not taken away Churches or Temples for divine ſervice in the mountaines, which were built by holy Fathers ere the building of the Temple, in which the Lord was wont to bee worſhipped? Surely, becauſe the Temple being now builded and ordained for divine ſervice, God would not haue any footſteps of any other chappell at all to bee extant. Therfore alſo when once the kingdome of Chriſt was manifeſted, the ceremonies and garments of Aaron ought not any more to take place. For this cauſe the Apoſtles were upon good ground carefull, that after Chriſts aſcention, they ſhould ſo be taken away, that no relickes of them remained. And if they tooke them away holily, unholily haue the Papiſts called them back againe. Now whether it be better to follow the godly ſimplicitie of the Apoſtles, or the ungodly pompe of the Papiſts, who is ignorant? This recalling of ſuch Popiſh garments, your gracious maieſtie may beleeue me, will bee a greater evill, then peradventure it may bee ſeene, even to very wiſe men at the firſt bluſh: For me thinkes I ſee and heare the Monks crying out with very loud voyces in the Pulpits, both confirming their followers in their ungodlie religion, by the example of your gracious Maieſtie, and alſo ſaying, What? doth not even the Queene of England alſo, a moſt learned and a moſt prudent Princeſs, beginne by little and little to come back to the religion of the holy Church of Rome, the moſt holy and ſacred veſtments of the Clergie men being taken on againe? We are to be in good hope that the day will come, wherein ſhe will a length, though now they be thought to be dead, recall alſo all the other rites and ſacraments of the holy Church of Rome. Theſe and ſuch like words, no doubt, moſt prudent Queene, the Monkes and Ieſuites will uſe in the Pulpits. For they take all occaſions to confirme their ſuperſtitions. Therfore to recall theſe ſtinking garments, and other rubbiſh of the Popiſh Church into the Church of Chriſt at this *time, What is it but to giue the Papiſts an occaſion, and the beſt that may bee, to confirme and harden themſelves and theirs in their ſuperſtitions, and alſo to helpe them in this buſineſſe? But let us heare What the Prophet ſayd to Jehoſaphat King of Juda, When he helped Ahab*; Dareſt thou helpe the wicked, and loue thoſe vvho hate the Lord? For this thing the vvrath of the Lord is vpon thee. *And What other thing Will this bee, then even to call backe the Weake from the ſtudie of pure Religion, and to giue them a privie Warning to looke backe, and returne into Ægipt? It is an eaſie matter for us Weake men, Who of our owne nature are prone to ſuperſtition, to ſlide backe to impietie. Therefore occaſions of ſliding backe to vngodlineſſe, ought to be taken away, and at no hand to bee given. And What elſe, I pray you, meant God in forbidding to plow With an Oxe and an Aſſe, to ſow the ſame field With diverſe kinds of ſeeds, and to Weare a garment Woven of linnen and Wollen together? It is an odious and deteſtable thing With God, that the ſame field of the Lord ſhould bee tilled by ungodlie and godlie Biſhops together; If in the ſame Church Popiſh Doctrine be taught With the Doctrine of the Goſpell; Finallie, if ſacraments, ceremonies, and rites, partlie Apoſtolicke, and partlie Popiſh, be uſed, and the Church bee cloathed With them as With a garment of linſey-Wolſey. For What agreement hath light With darkneſſe? And therfore thoſe things Which bee not of God, but from them Who haue defiled Gods Worſhip, are utterlie to be caſt away, which the Lord himſelfe commanded to bee done, When hee charged utterlie to deſtroy all things Which appertained to thoſe Who ſhould giue vs counſell to follow ſtrange Gods, and to burne their garments, and all their ſtuffe With fire in the middeſt of the ſtreet, to ſhew our deteſtation of ſuch Seducers, and that they might bee an execrable thing to the Lord. And Who knoweth not that theſe garments are a part of the houſhouldſtuffe of that Romiſh Seducer?* There ſhall cleave nothing of the execrable thing, ſayth hee, to thy hand, that the Lord may turne from the fierceneſſe of his wrath, and multiplie thee, as he hath ſworne to thy Fathers, &c. *Wherefore to bring theſe garments, ſeeing they bee the houſhold ſtuffe of Antichriſt, into the Church of Chriſt, What is it elſe then to provoke God to anger, and to kindle his furie againſt us? Certaine it is, that he Who is a true friend* of Chriſt, will neuer ſeeke to haue the ornaments of Antichriſt in his owne houſe, and much leſſe will hee ſuffer them in the Temple of Chriſt. For who can indure the armes of his enemie in his owne houſe, and ſpecially in the chiefeſt roome of the ſame? And if God will haue a thing deſtroyed and aboliſhed, who are we that we dare build it vp againe. But it is Gods will that after the death of Chriſt all garments of Aaron and Leui ſhould be aboliſhed: and hee hath plainlie enough manifeſted euerie where, that in theſe our dayes he would haue all vngodlie and vaine ceremonies, pompes, deceits, and paintings of the Papiſts driuen away by the ſhining brightneſſe of the Goſpell: becauſe theſe things haue no power in them to kindle and increaſe godlines, but greatlie auaile to the quenching of the ſame. Neither verilie can I ſee to what other end theſe garments tend, then in very deed (that I may now come vnto the ſecond head) to defile and diſgrace the faire face; nay, the whole bodie of the Church of England reformed according to the † Goſpell; as if the chaſte and honeſt daughter of a King ſhould bee attired with thoſe verie garments wherewith ſome famous and notable whoore uſed to bee adorned, and when ſhee were ſo clothed, were commanded to goe abroad in the ſtreets. Now who can allow or judge this to bee tolerable? Wherefore though for no other, yet for this very cauſe, ſuch garments ought not to bee thruſt upon the Church of Chriſt, becauſe that harlot of Rome hath abuſed, and doth ſtill at this day abuſe them (though in their owne nature they bee not euill) to euill, and to couer her fornications, or rather to entice men to commit fornication. For all theſe pompes, and Popiſh ceremonies are nothing elſe but whooriſh paintings inuented and deuiſed for this end, that men might thereby bee allured to ſpirituall fornication. Is it not therefore a filthie and diſhoneſt thing, to haue theſe in the Church of Chriſt? If the braſen ſerpent, which had beene ordained of God, and that for the wholeſome vſe of the Iſraelites, was taken away by godly King Ezekias, becauſe the Iſraelites had abuſed it contrarie to the word of God: and if Ezekias bee highlie commended for this ſo doing, becauſe hee had turned that Serpent into aſhes, and commanded them to bee caſt into the running water, that there might neuer bee any print or

† Vntrue, or miſinformed.

ſigne of it extant any more; how much more then are theſe vncleane garments to bee baniſhed out of the Church of God, ſeeing the Apoſtles never vſed them, but the Whoore of Rome hath uſed them in her Idolatrous Worſhip, and to ſeduce men? For it is a verie diſhoneſt thing, that ſuch things as are of themſelues indifferent, and haue been long uſed to the diſpight and diſhonour of God, ſhould bee retained in the Church of God, to the hazard of the ſalvation of godlie men. And much leſſe that kinde of garments, which is nothing but an invention of men, or rather of the Divell himſelfe, deviſed to ſeduce the ſimple ones. Wee all know what praiſe thoſe common-wealthes deſerue, which make good lawes that the ſubiects ſhall not weare out-landiſh and ſtrange apparrell, nor bring it into the Common-wealthes, becauſe it is a corruption of good and honeſt manners, and of the Common-wealthes themſelves. How then can that counſell which is given to your Maieſtie, bee commended, to wit, that garments unknowne to the Chriſtian World in tht time of the Apoſtles, and Apoſtolicall men, ſhould bee brought into the Church of Chriſt. And if an out-landiſh kinde of atire bee not tolerated in well-governed Common-wealthes. how much leſſe are Idolatrous, and heatheniſh garments to bee borne with in the Church, where God is to be worſhipped in ſpirit and truth, and where hee would haue few and verie ſimple ceremonies? Alſo if God eſtabliſhed by his Law, that a woman may not put on a mans apparrell, nor a man a womans, the one beeing ſo well of it ſelfe diſhoneſt, and contrarie to nature as the other: Why then ſhould godlie Biſhops, † and the ſervants of Chriſt bee clothed, or rather ſhamed and deformed with the garments of godleſſe Prieſts, and ſlaues of Antichriſt? Why ſhould wee not rather, as wee bee of a divers religion from them, ſo alſo be diſcerned from them, at leaſt in the performance of ſuch duties as belong unto Gods worſhip, by outward ſignes, ſuch as garments be? Verilie this was Gods will, and hee required of his people, that it ſhould bee diſcerned from the prophane Gentiles, as by other things, ſo alſo by a divers ſort of apparrell, and ſo ſhould profeſſe by this publicke ſigne, that it would haue nothing to doe with the Gentiles.

† ſtill miſinformed.

And why ſhould not wee doe the ſame? Are wee not the people of God? abides not the equitie of the ſame commandemet? And if the word honeſt bee derived of honour, what honour will it bee for the Church of Chriſt to haue Biſhops attired and diſguiſed with Popiſh viſors in the adminiſtration of the Goſpell and Sacraments, ſo as they ſhall rather be derided then be reverenced any whit by the people? And what commendation ſhall it be for your gracious Maieſtie in true Churches, and among true beleevers, that you permit ſuch trifles to bee called back into your Church? Therfore it ſtandeth not with honeſty, that holy Biſhops † be compelled to receiue ſuch viſors, neither is it indeed a matter worthy of honour and praiſe, neither deſerveth it the name of vertue. For if your Majeſtie ſhould command that all Engliſh men, leaving that ancient and very graue and comely attire, ſhould weare Turkie coats, or a ſouldiers weed, as it is called: who would ever approue this decree as honeſt? And it is much leſſe praiſe-worthy, if godly Biſhops be enioyned, laying aſide, or at leaſt changing the honeſt and ancient apparrell, which the Apoſtles wore, to wit, that common and graue habit, to put on the ridiculons and execrable or accurſed garments of godleſſe Maſſ-prieſts.

† ſtill miſ-informed.

Now concerning the third part of the Princes dutie, there is nothing fitter to trouble the publicke peace of the Church then this counſell. For everie noveltie, eſpecially in religion, either by it ſelfe, if it bee evill, diſturbs and troubles a good peace, or if it bee good, gives occaſion of trouble by accident, by cauſing contention betweene evill and good men. But as in things which be good of themſelves, of which nature the reformation of the Churches according to the will of God is, we are not to care for the troubling of that vngodlie peace, that is of the world (for Chriſt came not by his Goſpell to keep ſuch a peace, but rather to take it away, and to ſend a ſword) ſo aſſuredly, by the urging of things indifferent, to trouble the peace of Churches, and to cauſe ſtrife between good men and bad, yea between godlie men themſelues, is ſo wicked, that it can by no meanes bee defended, ſo that Ireneus had juſt cauſe to reproue Victor Biſhop of Rome, for this cauſe, as hath been ſayd afore. For it muſt needes bee, that at ſuch times the Churches be rent in peeces, then which thing, what is more hurtfull? Many examples in the hiſtories of the Church proue this which I ſay. How many and how great troubles aroſe in the Primitiue Church, between thoſe who beſide the Goſpell urged alſo circumciſion and the law, and between thoſe who upon good ground reiected them? And how great evills would this diſſention haue brought to the Church of Chriſt, had not the Apoſtles betime withſtood them by that councell gathered together at Jeruſalem, by a lawfull examination and diſcuſſing of the cauſe by manifeſt teſtimonis of the Scriptures, and by ſound reaſons? If your gracious Maieſtie (as you ought) deſire both to be and to ſeeme Apoſtolicke, then imitate the Apoſtles in this matter. Neither lay and impoſe this yoke upon the neckes of Chriſts Diſciples your ſelfe, nor ſuffer it to be impoſed by others. But if you ſee that the Biſhops diſagree about this matter among themſelves, aſſemble a Synod, and cauſe this controverſie to be examined by the Scriptures. And then looke what ſhall be proved by plaine teſtimonies, and ſtrong reaſons, propound that to be obſerved by all, and command by your decree, that that be obſerved, and ſo take diſagreement out of the Church. For your gracious Maieſtie ought to be verie carefull, that there be no innovation in religion, but according to the word of God. By this meanes ſhall a true peace, concord and unitie of the Churches bee preſerved. But if the proceeding be otherwiſe, what other thing will it be, then to take away vnitie, and to trouble the Chriſtian peace? And this I may not paſſe over with ſilence, that by this noveltie of the buſines, not onely the publick peace ſhall be troubled in that kingdome, but alſo manie elſe-where out of that kingdome will haue occaſion given them to raiſe new contentions in Churches, and that to the great hinderance of godlines, and the more ſlow proceeding of the Goſpell. For all men know, that the moſt part of all the Churches, who haue fallen from the Biſhop of Rome, for the Goſpels ſake, doe not onely want, but alſo abhorre thoſe garments, and that there be ſome Churches, though few in compariſon of the former, which doe as yet retaine thoſe garments invented in Poperie, as they verie ſtifly retaine ſome other things alſo, becauſe the reformers of thoſe Churches, otherwiſe worthy men, and verie faithfull ſervants of Chriſt, durſt not at the firſt (neither iudged they it expedient) utterly aboliſh all Popiſh things. But as the common manner is, every man likes his owne beſt. Now I call thoſe things a mans owne, not ſo much which everie man hath invented, as thoſe be-

ſide, which every man chooſeth to himſelfe, receiveth, retaineth, and purſueth, though they be invented to his hand by others. But if there be alſo annexed the examples of other men, they bee more and more hardened in them, and are not onely hardened, but alſo doe their uttermoſt endevour by word and writing, to draw all the reſt to be of their minde? Therfore wee eaſilie ſee what the iſſue wil bee, if your gracious Maieſtie admit of that counſell which ſome doe give you, to take on apparrell, and other more Popiſh things beſides. For ſome men, who be not well occupied, being ſtirred up by the example of your Maieſtie, will write bookes and diſperſe them throughout all Germanie, of theſe things which they call indifferent, to wit, that it is lawfull to admit of them, nay that they be altogether to be retained, that Papiſts may bee the leſſe eſtranged aad alienated from us, and ſo we may come the neerer to concord and agreement. As if forſooth the Papiſts, though we for peace ſake admitted of all thoſe things, would ever amend their Doctrine, and baniſh out of their Churches, or at any hand lay downe their falſe and godleſs decrees, manifeſt and abhominable ſuperſtitions and idolatries: and there will bee ſome who will anſwer ſuch bookes once diſperſed. So of this Engliſh fire there will riſe a new burning flame in Germanie and France, on which hot coles the Papiſts as ſo many Smiths a forging, will ſprinkle cold water to make the flame the more vehement. And is not this a goodly benefite? Who therefore doth not ſee that this counſell tends to the troubling of all Churches.

To conclude, that golden ſaying of a certaine learned man is verie true and certaine, and approved by long experience, that indifferent things, that is, the queſtion about indifferent things, is that golden apple of contention. So much ſhall ſuffice to have ſpoken of the troubling of publick peace; what ſhould I ſay of the conſciences of privat belevers? It is manifeſt, that they are greatly troubled with this commandement, to put on theſe linnen garments. For they do ſo greatly complain, that their lamenting voyces & grones doe reach unto, and are heard in Germany. Now how grievous and diſtaſtfull an offence it is to trouble the conſciences of the godly, the holy Scripture ſheweth: partly when it commandeth that we make not the holy Spirit ſad, neither offend the weak ones; partly when it threatneth grivous puniſhments againſt thoſe who *feare not to doe theſe things: partly alſo when it propoundeth the examples of the Saints, and ſpecially of Paul, who ſpeakes thus;* If meat offend my brother, Ile eat no fleſh while the world ſtandeth, that I may not offend my brother. *For in thoſe words hee giveth a generall rule, by his example, taken out of the doctrine of Chriſt, to wit, that no indifferent thing is to be admitted and yeelded unto, much leſs to bee urged upon others, and leaſt of all to be commended by decree: if in the admitting, urging & commanding of it, the minds of good men, and conſciences of the faithfull be offended; for a tender conſcience, which feareth God, is a thing moſt pretious and acceptable to God. How therefore can that counſell be approved, which would haue a law eſtabliſhed and proclaimed by the Princes command for the uſe of garments to be uſed by Miniſters in the miniſterie. For (to ſpeak many things in few words) if ſuch garments be to be propounded to the faithfull, they are to be propounded either as indifferent, or as neceſſary: if the later, wee doe ungodlily, becauſe we make thoſe things neceſſarie, which Chriſt would haue to be free: If the former, then are they to be left free to the Churches. But by commanding and compelling, we make things that bee free and indifferent, to be neceſſarie, and ſo fall into the ſame treſpaſſe. Moreover, either they be ordained of God by Moſes, or they be delivered by Chriſt God manifeſted in the fleſh, or they be ordained by the holy Ghoſt working and ſpeaking in the Apoſtles, or they are of men, either godly or wicked. Thoſe ceremonies and Levitical garments, which were ordained of God by Moſes, ought all of them to haue an end after the death of Chriſt, as the ſcriptures ſhew plainly, eſpecially the Epiſtles of Paul to the Coloſſ. and Hebr. therfore they cannot be revoked & called back without the tranſgreſſion of Gods will. It cannot be ſayd that Chriſt taught them, becauſe ther is no word extant to that end, but rather he taught plainly oftentimes, that all Moſes his ceremonies were ended. And the ſame I affirme concerning the Apoſtles. It remaines therefore that they be ſayd to be of men. If they be from godly men, then were they ordained of them, either to edification, or for order and comelines. But they avail not to edification, that is, to further comelines, but rather tend to the overthrow of it, as we ſaw before; neither for any good order, but rather they tend to diſorder, for there is a confuſion of godly and wicked Biſhops, whereas it is meet and equall, that one of them bee diſcerned*

from another, even by their garments alſo. Neither doe they make
Chriſts ſpouſe comelie, as We ſhewed a little before. Therfore We ought
not to yeeld unto them. And ſuch things as haue been invented by men,
voyd of Gods ſpirit, doe nothing apperteine to us. Laſtly, the Apoſtles
uſed not theſe garments. For We haue no authenticke teſtimonie. Now
the Church is to be faſhioned after the rule of that Apoſtolicall Church
in ceremonies and garments, as Well as in Doctrine. What doe Wee
then With theſe garments in the Church? By Whoſe authoritie can they
be approved? What profit or Wholſome uſe can the Chriſtian people
haue by them? But on the contrarie We haue ſhewed that godlineſs is
Weakned by them, the pure Worſhip of God is violated, Popiſh ſuper-
ſtition is by little and little called back, the godlie be offended, the Wic-
ked be confirmed and hardened in their ungodlineſſes; the Weak in faith
are brought into hazard of their ſalvation; there are occaſions of many
evills given; Monkes and other Popiſh preachers are hereby helped to
confirme their followers in their ſuperſtition; the Wrath of God
is provoked againſt us; thoſe things Which God Would haue to bee
deſtroyed, are hereby builded againe by u; the Whole face of the Church
is defiled and diſgraced: there is a foule ſinne committed againſt ho-
neſt and good lawes forbidding the putting on of ſtrange and outlan-
diſh garments: and ſo the Whole Church is diſhonored. Beſides, the
publick peace of the Church, yea of many Churches is troubled: one
Biſhop is ſet againſt another, the conſciences of the godly are troubled,
and the minds of goood men are offended, Gods ſpirit is made ſad in
them, and this apple of contention is caſt, as it Were, upon the table of
the Gods.

Now ſeeing the matter ſtands thus, moſt gracious Queene, not one-
ly I, but all my fellow-miniſters, and all the godly proſtrate before you,
intreat your Maieſtie, and for Ieſus Chriſts ſake, Whom We are per-
ſwaded you loue from your heart, We humbly beſeech your Maieſtie
not to embrace that counſell aforeſayd, neither to giue eare to ſuch coun-
ſellors. For theſe counſells (moſt godly Queene) are not for the good
of that your Church and kingdome, nor for the honor of your Maie-
ſtie, ſeeing they neither ſerve to the increaſe of godlineſs, nor to the re-
taining of the honeſtie of the Church, neither to the preſervation of pub-
lick peace, but rather verie greatly Weaken all theſe good things, Which

your Princely Ma. ought chieflie to ſtand for. Let your Ma. rather bend all your thoughts,authoritie and power hereunto, that firſt and aboue all you may haue Biſhops,who be trulie godlie, and well exerciſed in the holie ſcriptures,as by the bleſſing of God you haue very many, and that you make much of,and giue eare to them. Secondlie, that you bee carefull that with all diligence they may diſcarge their office, watching over the flock, teach ſound doctrine, confute hereſies, driue away Wolues,keepe everie man in his own calling,and exhort and ſtirre up everie man to lead a life beſeeming a Chriſtian. The Elders alſo and Deacons are to be admoniſhed,that everie one be diligent in his own office,and if need be,they are to be compelled by your gracious Ma.authothoritie,that neither the former by their ſleeping and winking at the miſdemeanors of the flock, ſuffer the reines to be looſed to all licentiouſnes,and to the luſts of the fleſh; neither that the later, by reaſon of their immoderate care for their own private buſineſſes,neglect the poore people of the Church, and omit ſuch other things as belong to their office. For theſe three ſorts of men bee the verie ſinewes of the Church, upon whom the ſalvation or deſtruction of the Church doth chieflie depend. Furthermore, your gracious Ma. ought to vſe great care and diligence,that the Vniverſities,and in them good and godlie teachers, bee well looked to, cheriſhed,liberally maintained and preſerved, for theſe are as the mothers,and nurſes of the Churches, in which and by which thoſe are to be faſhioned,borne,brought up and adorned, who being fit, may be called from time to time to rule and governe the Churches. Laſt of all,ſuch things as cannot be corrected & amended by the word and diſcipline of the Church,as it is neceſſarie, that according to Gods word they be cut off and taken away by the ſword of the Magiſtrate, ſo your gracious Maieſtie is to take care of them; as adulteries, blaſphemies,and other capitall crimes of that ſort. For God hath given the Magiſtrate the ſword for this end,that ungodly ſeducers,filthy knaues, and unquiet men being reſtrayned,the reſt may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godlines and honeſty. This is the matter (moſt gracious Queen) whereon you are to ſpend your thoughts, hereabout are your counſells to be occupied, here is all your ſtrength to be ſhewed, namely, that (to end in a word) we all denying vngodlines and worldly luſts, may liue ſoberly, juſtly,and godlily in this preſent world. For this

In making 3 ſorts of officers aſterwards Biſhops,Seniors,or Elders & Deacons, hee muſt take word Biſhop in the ſcripture language,as common to all Paſtors.

Q

is the true and faireſt garment of all other. For which everie man ought to take care, to wit, that having] put off the old man with his workes, we put on the new man, that is, our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, neither are there any other true ornaments which become Chriſtian Biſhops, beſides thoſe which the Apoſtle hath laid downe in his writings to Tim. and Tit. A Biſhop muſt bee unreproveable, the huſband of one vvife, vvatching, ſober, modeſt, harborous, apt to teach, not given to vvine, no ſtryker, nor given to filthy lucre, but gentle, no fighter, not covetous, one that can rule his houſe honeſtly, having children under obedience in all honeſtie, not froward, not angrie, righteous, holy, &c. *For garments and ornaments of Aarons high Prieſt, were types of theſe true ornaments; thoſe were the ſhadowes, theſe be the bodie. Wherefore let thoſe bee gone, and let theſe abide ſtill. And then at length ſhall we haue the whole Church, and ſo the Biſhops rightlie and trulie apparrelled.*

Once againe I humblie beſeech your gracious Maieſtie, that thinking no more of thoſe outward garments, you will mind and conſider how theſe true and ſpirituall ornaments may be retained, put upon, and kept in the Churches. And as I ſaid in the beginning, that according to your gracious Maieſties clemencie you will be pleaſed to pardon my boldnes in writing. Our Lord Jeſus Chriſt long preſerue your gracious Maieſtie ſafe and ſound to vs, and to the whole Church. **From Heidelberg.** *10. Septemb. 1571.*

THus (good ſir) you ſee how I haue endevoured to ſatisfie your deſire concerning the general part of the Defence. If this doe not fully content you, I vvill (if it pleaſe God) add vvhat is vvanting another time. For it is fit vve ſhould helpe one another in private, concerning theſe things, leſt the publick ſway of formalitie ſhould make us forget or forgoe that ſinceritie vvhich thoſe men of God taught us, in whom vvhen we vvere yet children, we ſaw the power of godlines that made us loue their footſteps.]

Bleſſed is he that watcheth, and keepeth his garments, leſt he walke naked, and they ſee his ſhame, Apoc. 16. 15.

I haue added to the Authors Reply, but without his knowledge, the advertiſement following, to fill up this page, which without ſome purpoſe had otherwiſe been left blank.

WHEN you finde, good Reader, any ſtraggling teſtimonies of ſome few forraine Divines alledged by the formaliſts, which ſeeme to favour of toleration, conſider firſt that ſome did write in the dawning of the day of reformation, and therefore could not ſo ſoone ſee diſtinctly and clearly every corruption which was in the Church, 2. That notvvithſtanding of greater light ſhining in the Church, after the riſing of the Sun aboue our Horizon, the Divines treating upon many poynts, could not bee exact in everie one, or intending principally to beat downe ſuch corruptions as did moſt aſſault their owne Churches, no vvonder that there fell from their pens ſome ſentences not ripely digeſted concerning other poynts. 3. That howbeit theſe had purpoſely ſet themſelues to conſider the controverſies of our Churches, yet not being throughly acquainted with the particular ſtate of the ſame, might giue their iudgment in the generall caſe, but could not ſo vvell in the particular, as many worthy Divines in England haue done. 4. They vvere but men, and might erre in judgement, and ſo appeareth by the vveak reaſons ſubjoyned ſomtimes to their opinions. And living in Churches vvhere ſome corruptions doe remaine, they might the more readily ſtumble at the like in others. 6. It hath been the practiſe of the Engliſh Prelates from time to time, and is at this preſent houre, not onely to offer preferment to Divines at home, but alſo to ſend gifts to forraine Divines, to blunt at leaſt the edge of their zeale, if they could not make them altogether their own, as they haue done ſome. For proofe of this their old practiſe I haue here ſubjoyned a few lines taken out of the friendly caveat to B. *Sands*, then Biſhop of London, vvritten *anno* 1567. extant in the book intituled, *The Regiſter*.

Although you haue, as much as in you lieth, gone about to win credit, and as it were to tie the tongues of Bullinger, Gualter, *Zanchius, and others with your bribes, which you haue divers times ſent them under the name of friendly tokens and remembrances, yet when they ſhal be informed better of more then they were the laſt time, and confirmed in the former ſatisfaction of theſe two laſt ſet forth bookes, as well theſe that I haue named, as divers more wil not bee aſhamed, like true and conſtant profeſſors of the truth, to anſwer your L. as* Ariſtotle *did* Plato, *when he ſaid,* Amicus Plato, ſed magis amica viritas, *that is to ſay, openly to confeſſe, not in privat meeting onely, but in print alſo, that* Engliſh *tinne,* Engliſh *cloathes,* *and Engliſh ſilver and gold are, and ſhall bee welcome to them, as long as they are not meant to ſtop them from the truth againſt both their conſcience, and their printed writings and confeſſions. Yea if yee will look well on the matter,* Gualter *hath condemned you and your* ſplendida Pontificalia *alreadie. For in his laſt Epiſtle to you Lords, he denieth not that thoſe informations, theſe two that he ſpeaketh of delivered him, were intollerable in the Church: but truſting onely upon your words, and beleeving your coloured lying informations too much, would not credit them as too too monſtrous things to bee in ſuch a realme, that haue alway had ſo good a report for zealouſneſſe in religion, and to be maintained of ſuch men, that in time of their baniſhment, both hee himſelfe, and a great ſort more knew to be godlie, learned, and earneſt in religion.*

M*Elanchton* did write in the dawning of the day. *Zanchius* in an Epiſtle to *Bullinger*, reporteth that he was of a fearefull ſpirit, and did many things which he did not approue. His advices in the time of the *Interim* proved pernicious to the Germane Churches, and grievous to all the godly. Harder things, if true, are written concerning him. *P. Martyr*, freer in writing after he had left England then he was before, in a letter to a certaine friend there, confeſſeth his overſight in adviſing rather to conform to Popiſh apparell then to leaue the Miniſterie, and that now with *Bullinger* he was of another minde, ſeeing the ſcandals which did ariſe unavoideably of them, which he did not perceiue before. He confeſſeth in another Epiſtle to a certaine friend there, that he could not giue full and particular direction not being acquainted with all the particular circumſtances. *Tu autem qui es in ipſo certamine conſilia hic non expecta. Valde quippe ſumus à vobis procul. In ipſa conſultetis arena.* Which anſwer holdeth in other forraine Divines. The Author of this ſound Reply, craving the removall or at leaſt the free uſe of the ceremonies, and that none be enthralled; or ſaying if there Deanes, Canons, and Prebendaries will practiſe them in their Cathedrall Churches, they will not contend with them, providing the Prelates impoſe them not upon others, is to be underſtood to ſpeak onely of the Engliſh Church, where they haue kept poſſeſſion ever ſince the Reformation, and as a man almoſt deſpairing of any cure after theſe fifty yeares conteſtation againſt them, rather then reſolving. But all Writers condemn the reducing of corruptions into a Church, ſpecially after exile of many yeares. Many worthies haue ſuffered much for Reformation, what would they haue done to withſtand the re-entry of Deformation?

FINIS.

A Booke
WHICH SHEWETH THE
life and manners of all true Christians,
and howe vnlike they are vnto Turkes and Papiſtes
and Heathen folke.

**Alſo the pointes and partes of all diuinitie, that is of the reuealed will and worde of God are
declared by their ſeuerall Definitions
*and Diuiſions in order as followeth.***

¶ Alſo there goeth a Treatiſe before of
Reformation without tarying for anie, and of the wickedneſſe of thoſe Preachers, which will not reforme them
ſelues and their charge, becauſe they will
tarie till the Magiſtrate commaunde
and compell them.

By me, ROBERT BROVVNE.

By me Elizabeth freman

MIDDELBVRGH,
¶ *Imprinted by Richarde Painter.*
1582.